AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VII.—(XVII.)—DECEMBER, 1897.—No. 6.

PRESENT POSITION OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION IN IRELAND: ITS STRUGGLES, ITS TRIUMPHS, ITS HOPES.

THERE is good reason to hope that Ireland's claim to a Catholic University may be at length satisfied by the present Conservative Government. The demand has been pressed for years in successive Cabinets, by the Irish representatives. And the Catholic Bishops have repeated time after time a dignified protest against the inequality of the present system, but hitherto English statesmen had been indifferent, if not averse, to any suggestions of redress. For the last few years, however, a large growth of non-Catholic opinion in Ireland has become very favorable to the Catholic claims; Protestant Nationalists have advocated them as warmly as the Catholics themselves, and a prominent Irish Unionist declared that if the Irish members of all parties were allowed to decide the question, they would be able to make a satisfactory arrangement in a couple of hours.

This growth of feeling has emboldened enlightened leaders, like Mr. Balfour, to give their adhesion to the principle of a Catholic University, which they must have themselves recognized as equitable. The matter was, of course, a dangerous one for any English minister to bring before the House of Commons, as he could not foresee what latent forces

of intolerance might oppose it in the ranks of his own party; but the present government feels sufficiently confident of the support of public opinion to venture a settlement of the difficulty, if the two contracting parties can agree upon a groundwork. It is quite possible that obstacles may arise, or that a constitution cannot be devised which will meet the wishes of the Irish Bishops and people, and at the same time be such as the English Cabinet may venture to submit to their supporters; but, if the unanimity that exists with regard to the principle can produce a united assent to the particulars, there is every probability of the near foundation of a Catholic University.

The present disadvantages of Catholics with regard to university education are a very real grievance, which is accentuated by the rich endowments of their Protestant fellow-countrymen and the abundant opportunities thereby offered to them of culture and training, and advancement. But from one point of view Catholics may feel glad of the inequality they suffer, since it has been the means of showing that, handicapped as they were, they have been able to get abreast of and to pass by their Protestant comrades in competition. In the examinations of the Royal University where Catholics and Protestants meet on a common field and strive for the same honors, the Catholic colleges, though receiving no assistance for preparing their pupils, have borne off the palm from their wealthy rivals, whom the State had enabled to supply every equipment for the instruction and encouragement of their students.

There exist at present two universities in Ireland—Trinity College, or Dublin University, founded in 1593, and the Royal University, established by Parliament in 1880. Trinity College is a fine old institution of which Irishmen must always feel proud. For over three hundred years it has maintained a place amongst the chief educational establishments of the world, and its noble old walls, grimed with the weather of those centuries, have nursed the genius of our geatest orators and poets, and not a few of our most loved patriots. From it came Burke and Curran, Grattan and

Emmet, Davis and Moore, and many another whose name makes us look fondly on the home of his student life. It has a record all through of high-class learning; and in these latter days it has produced men of as deep scholarship and as many-sided talents as any university in the three kingdoms. But Catholics though rejoicing in its fame as a seat of Irish learning and a centre of Irish intellectual power, can feel little share in its stores or little sympathy with its history. It was established by Elizabeth's government to introduce the English religion and English ascendancy into Ireland; to be the nursing-mother of the new creed and to disseminate its professors through the country to usurp the altars and homes of the old stock; and also to inoculate the people with the English influence and sap if it could not root out the spirit of Irish nationality. It was enriched with the broad estates robbed from the chiefs of the north and with the confiscated abbeys of the old faith. During the first two hundred years of its existence it was the headquarters of anti-Irish sentiment and Protestant aggression, and even in the close of the last century, when it opened its doors to Catholics, it took care to formally exclude them from all share in its prizes and emoluments. The old spirit of fierce intolerance has of course long ago yielded to the better feelings of this century and the lectures and rewards of the College are now open to all; but it is still a Protestant university teaching Protestant theology and observing Protestant ritual, and the atmosphere of the student-life there is essentially English and anti-national.

The second Irish university—the Royal—is the only one of which Catholics can avail themselves and it is to its examinations that Catholic colleges direct their higher studies. This university is merely an examining board authorized to confer degrees, and has no official colleges or lectures. Although it came into existence only in 1880, it is necessary, in order to form a proper idea of its position, to go back many more years in the history of our educational legislation. Over fifty years ago, the State, recognizing the duty of providing some means of higher education for Catholics and Dissenters, who though admitted to its degrees, were

still excluded from all the rewards of Trinity College, founded the "Queen's University" for their use. This university was to consist of three teaching colleges, one in Belfast, one in Galway and one in Cork, and to be governed by a senate and a body of Fellows chosen from the staffs of the three colleges, who should subject the students to a common examination and confer degrees. The colleges were to be open to Protestants, Catholics and Dissenters without distinction, and the unsectarian character of their management was carried to the extreme of excluding the profession and practice of all religion from the student life within their walls. The Catholic Bishops and people protested against such a system of Godless education and made the Government aware that they refused to regard this scheme as any alleviation of their disabilities; but the ministry made no effort to meet their views and the three Queen's Colleges were established by law in 1845 with their objectionable constitution unamended, and a yearly grant of $105,000 fixed on them to provide salaries, scholarships and expenses of maintenance.

On October 30, 1849, the colleges opened their classes, and in the following year a charter was granted founding the Queen's University. A great body of Presbyterians and many Protestants at once availed themselves of the lectures and degrees, but the great majority of Catholics held aloof from a student career which was divorced from all religion.

The result was that the Belfast College, lying in the centre of a Presbyterian district, soon became a most successful institution and has since discharged a most useful work in affording a university education to the dissenting and Protestant youth of Ulster, whilst the Colleges of Cork and Galway, though equipped with an equally cultured and able staff of professors, have maintained but a languishing existence with a paltry attendance of students, and except for the Catholics attending the medical classes, have hardly contributed anything to the training of the population amongst which they are placed.

The Catholics, disappointed in the hope of a State-assisted education of which they could avail themselves without prejudice to their religion, determined to found a university of their own. The Synod of Thurles, in 1851, suggested a constitution which was eagerly welcomed by the people and supported by immense contributions from our people at home and in America. A college was founded in Dublin, a capable staff of professors employed, and Dr. Newman brought over to be its rector. The Catholic body now petitioned the Government for a charter to grant degrees. They sought for no endowment or support of any sort; they would subsidize the university themselves if they were only authorized, on giving satisfactory evidence of efficiency, to confer degrees; but this, after a half-hearted attempt to amalgamate them with the Queen's University, Parliament refused.

In this state the education question remained for nearly thirty years. The Catholics losing hope almost lost interest in their needs, and their colleges had nothing but the Examining University of London to which to send a few brilliant students. The Queen's University pursued its way with moderate success and a very fair repute, receiving from $125,000 to $140,000 annually from the State; imparting a sound training to its students and producing many graduates who have since won distinction in public life. Finally, however, some prominent Irish members, Protestant and Catholic, united to press a plan of Catholic education on the Government, and Lord Beaconsfield, the Premier, proposed and carried as a compromise the scheme of the present Royal University.

The University Act of 1879 arranged a Constitution for the new body and decreed that the Queen's University should be dissolved and its powers merged in the new Board. A Charter of April 27, 1880, founded the Royal University, and appointed a governing body of Senators; and the Royal University Act of 1881 made it a grant of $100,000 a year out of the Irish Church Fund. The Senate thus constituted immediately set about framing regulations for the working

of the university, arranged examination courses and appointed Fellows; and the whole system of examination came into use in autumn, 1882. The radical difference between this new Institution and the old Queen's University, was that the Royal was formed as merely an examining university—not a teaching or residential one. It has no colleges, and no connection with any teaching establishment whatever. It requires no attendance (except of course in the case of medical students) at any classes, nor any keeping of terms. Its degrees and prizes are open to all to compete for, regardless of where they have carried on their studies. The endowments of the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Galway and Cork were not interfered with; they still receive about $125,000 a year from the Treasury, and remain teaching colleges preparing students for the Royal University examinations, but attendance at their lectures is no more qualification for the University's degrees than studies pursued anywhere else.

The Fellows of the University in addition to forming an Examining Board are required by the Statutes to teach, if called upon by the Senate, in some educational establishment which it shall approve, but these schools have no preëminence and receive no recognition from the University beyond any other. As a matter of fact the Fellows are chosen from the professors of the five most important colleges which prepare students for the University examinations: the three Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Cork and Galway, the Presbyterian "Magee College," Londonderry, and the Catholic University College, Dublin.

This is the means provided by Parliament for meeting the wants of the Catholics. It is of course an insufficient one; for examinations are a very small part of the education of a university apart from the student-life, and the professors' lectures, and these are not provided by the Royal. It is also an unequal arrangement, for the Catholics receive no assistance from the State to prepare for these examinations, whilst non-Catholics have the three colleges provided for them as under the old system; but it was welcomed as giving Cath-

olics an opportunity of winning university degrees and prizes, without loss of principle ; and as a first, though imperfect admission, of the claim of the majority of the Irish people to education according to their own desires.

For the fifteen years of its existence the Royal University, as far as its powers of education go, has worked well. Its Senate has been formed of the most eminent and most respected representatives of the different Churches and the different departments of Irish life. Its roll of Fellows includes gifted scholars and practical educationalists whose names carry weight in all the seats of learning ; and amongst its graduates are many whose attainments have already won them the highest recognition.

The degrees of the University.stand high in the estimation of the public, and the fame and credit it has obtained in so short a period are most gratifying to all interested in Irish education. The courses prescribed and the standard fixed for degrees ensure a very complete and very sound education—the qualifications required are universally regarded as more exacting than the much honored corresponding degrees of Trinity College—and the popularity and success of the University is proved by the great number of student, Catholics, Protestant and Presbyterian, whom it attracts every year to its examinations. Another characteristic which the Royal University rightly claims among its distinctions is that it has been one of the pioneers of higher education for women, admitting them on the same terms as men to all the examinations—a step which the great English universities have not yet ventured upon ; and the number of ladies who have yearly obtained its degrees and in many cases disputed its highest honors is one of the proudest features of its career.

The grievances under which Catholics still suffer are not, then, due to the constitution or working of the Royal University. They have equal representation on the Board of Senators ; they are on absolutely equal terms with their rivals at the examinations. The wants of the students have been most carefully met by the Protestant section of the Senate,

a duplicate philosophy course—Catholic and Protestant—being provided to suit each class; and in the appointment of Fellows they have got every justice. Nothing could be fairer or more considerate than the action of the Protestant Senators has been on questions affecting Catholic interests, all through the existence of the Board. In the matter of the salaries paid to Fellows the Catholics receive a much larger share of the funds of the University than do the non-Catholics; the statutes prescribe that any Fellow who is receiving a salary in a college endowed with public money shall only be paid by the Royal University the amount required to make his income up to the $2,000 which is the yearly stipend for a Fellow, and as nine out of the twelve non-Catholic Fellows are Professors in one or the other of the Queen's Colleges, and are thereby in receipt of a salary out of the Treasury grant, the amount which they receive from the Royal University is very much less than the amounts drawn by the twelve Catholic Fellows who, having no other endowments, are paid in full.

In all these particulars the Catholics have every reason to be satisfied though this distribution of Senators and Fellowships is far from fair relative to the Catholic population; but the complaint they can still justly make is that the State while giving each section an equal share in the honors and rewards of the University, actually prepares their non-Catholic comrades for these examinations, but offers Catholics no assistance. They have, of course, twelve Catholic Fellows, but the constitution of the University makes no provision for securing their lectures for Catholic students. The Senate in its desire for equality and justice gives the Catholic students the benefit of their Fellows' instructions by chosing them from amongst the teachers in Catholic colleges, and it also, in its choice of half the examiners, augments the income of some other Catholic teachers, by employing them to judge the examination papers; but Parliament made no provisiou for this equitable use of the funds it granted the Royal University. It supplies no teachers for Catholic students, no buildings for their classes,

no libraries or museums, no prizes or scholarships to reward study during the year's course; none of the educating influences of collegiate life.

The non-Catholics on the other hand have the three Queen's Colleges at their disposal, magnificent buildings, furnished with libraries and all the requirements of research, and carried on entirely at the public expense. The grant of $42,500 a year which each college receives from the Treasury enables it to support nearly a score of most able and distinguished professors, a President and house officers, and a staff of servants; affords from $4,000 to $5,000 for additions each year to the books and scientific departments, and supplies fifty-four scholarships amounting to $7,500 to be divided among its students. The average attendance at these colleges for the past ten years has been: at Belfast 432, at Cork 238 and at Galway 110, from which we may see the liberal proportion of the prizes to the students; and if we exclude the professional classes, Medical, Law and Engineering, and compare the number of scholarships assigned to the Arts course—that is the general university programme of literature and science—with the number of students following that course, we find that last year there was a scholarship available in Belfast for every four students, in Galway for every one and half, and in Cork for every single student at the lectures. In addition to this the Belfast College has over $2,900 for distribution in prizes each year, the gifts of private benefactors, whom its success and efficiency naturally prompted to encourage it.

It is with this system of almost free education that Catholic schools come into competition at the examinations of the Royal University. The students who prepare for the university course are handicapped by the advantages thus given the Protestants and Presbyterians, but the much more serious grievance of the whole Catholic youth of Ireland is felt by those who cannot afford the expenses of a Catholic college, and are thereby excluded altogether from a university education, while non-Catholics of equally slender means can have a practically free education at one of the Queen's

Colleges, if they have any moderate talent. Hence the Catholic University has only about 170 students to compete with the large numbers of Belfast and Cork. Moreover, there is another most important factor which must not be overlooked in this comparison. The Protestants of Ireland have three hundred years of educational tradition to fall back on; they have grown up with England's civilization and prosperity; they are made fat on rack rents, tithes and confiscation, and they stand to-day on the vantage ground of wealth and power and patronage. The Catholics of Ireland have passed through centuries of a persecution which burnt out their civilization, closed their schools, put their education under a ban, made the sound of their mother-tongue a treason on their lips, gagged and fettered their national life, and reduced them to a poverty and servitude sufficient to crush out the very instincts of intellectual progress from many another people. The night was heavy upon them and they are now barely passing into the light of day. Even the primary schools were given, as the many other gifts of the *Paternal* Government, to poison the hearts of our young, to freeze out the spirit of patriotism and corrupt the purity of Faith. They were godless gifts, but God knew how to draw good out of evil. In this modern world of progress and enlightment, of schools and colleges and universities, it has been Catholic Ireland's privilege, by a half-hearted concession, to be able to offer herself, without violence to her conscience, for university degrees, only within the last sixteen years. Under these circumstances it would be little to the discredit of the Catholic colleges if they held a very secondary position to the Queen's Colleges in the results lists of the Royal University. The instinct and wealth of tradition, facilities for study, the high endowments, the excellent teaching and the encouragement in the shape of prizes, afforded the Queen's Colleges' pupils, ought naturally to enable them to win the highest places in the examinations, and as their roll of students is so much larger than that of any other institution by reason of the many scholarships which make instruction almost free, it might be expected

that they would secure the great majority of the university distinctions. The contrary is, however, the case. Belfast Queen's College, indeed, heads the list of successes for the first years, but the Catholic University College, Dublin, invariably makes a good second and leaves the remaining Queen's Colleges very far behind, whilst for the last four years it strode ahead of them all.

Before considering the details of each school's performance, it may be well to state that University College, Dublin, conducted by the Jesuits, is the chief Catholic college for higher education in Ireland, and forms along with the three Queen's colleges the four principal institutions which direct all their studies to the courses of the Royal University. In addition to these, Magee College, the fine Presbyterian establishment of Londonderry, maintains an honorable position in the results list each year, as does also the Catholic Blackrock University College—an adjunct to the celebrated Intermediate School of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost—which made a brilliant display of Catholic talent and scored many notable successes in the early years of the Royal University, although of late years the studies have generally followed other courses, and only a few students present themselves for the Royal examinations.

The two Jesuit colleges of Clongowes Wood, Kildare, and Mungret College, Limerick, though making intermediate education their chief care, occasionally keep a few boys for some years of their university course, and generally do themselves credit in the result. Some other schools—Catholic and non-Catholic—notably the excellent Methodist College, Belfast, present pupils from time to time for the university examinations, and, of course, many other candidates prepare themselves by private study; but it may be taken, roughly speaking, that the great majority of Catholic boys attend University College, Dublin, and the great majority of non-Catholics attend one or other of the Queen's Colleges.

The Royal University, in addition to degrees in arts, confers each year degrees in medicine, music, law and

engineering. A limited number present themselves each year for the three last degrees, but there are always a great many candidates for the medical examinations. The arts degrees are, of course, the real university education course, and it is of these examinations only that we are speaking. There is a Catholic University Medical School in Dublin which may be regarded as affiliated to University College, and the students of which receive some of their lectures in University College; the Queen's Colleges also have each a medical department, but in this comparison of the advantages and merits of each we are dealing only with the arts classes and examinations.

The course for the degree of B.A. covers three years. When a student has entered the university by passing the matriculation he has a year's preparation for the first arts examination in all the general branches of study, after which he specializes his subjects and devotes himself to an extended course of either ancient or modern languages, or mathematics and science. The second arts examination comes a year after the first, and after the interval of another year he is eligible for the examination for the degree. The B.A. degree may be obtained by answering in any of the following classes of subjects: Classics, modern languages, philosophy, history and political economy, mathematics or science. For all these examinations the student may elect to study either a pass or an honors course—the honors including the pass programme with an increased and extended range of matter. Those whose answering on any honors paper reaches a certain standard are adjudged to have won honors in that subject, and exhibitions, varying with the examinations from $60 to $210, are awarded to the first thirty, or, in the case of the B.A. examination, to the first twenty-one, in the aggregate total of marks. Candidates may present themselves for the M. A. degree a year after obtaining the B.A., and have the same choice of subjects to be examined in. It is entirely an honors examination, but only those who reach a very high standard are acknowledged to pass with honors.

In addition to the exhibitions there are ten scholarships offered each year to competitors who have passed their entrance, and from three to five studentships of $1,500 each are awarded annually in connection with the M.A. examination.

The following tables show the successes achieved by the Queen's Colleges and University College for the last eight years. To avoid confusion we have not added the names of any other teaching establishments. They are unnecessary for our comparison, except in so far as they show that the Cork and Galway Queen's Colleges hardly ever fill the third or fourth places in the results list, but are generally outdistanced by many other institutions, notably Blackrock College and St. Mary's University, Dublin, conducted by the Sisters.

As the results of the B. A. examination of 1897 are not yet known, we have not thought well to insert the First and Second Arts results in the above tables. They are, however, so emphatic as a Catholic triumph that we cannot forbear mentioning them here. We shall cite the editorial words of the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*: "The feature of the results of the competition for '97 among the students of the University is, as usual, the complete and *sweeping triumph of the unendowed Catholic Colleges*, and the almost as complete collapse of the well endowed Queen's Colleges at Galway and Cork. Indeed, the farce of spending seven or eight thousand pounds a year on the Arts Faculties in these two latter institutions was never more completely demonstrated. *University College once more comes out victoriously first, even in competition with the only successful Queen's College, that in Belfast.* Alike in the number and the quality of the distinctions won the Catholic College is far ahead. *It has gained fifty-one distinctions, as compared with Belfast's forty-six*, Galway's eighteen and Cork's six. *Thirty-two of its distinctions are in the first class, while only sixteen of Belfast's, eight of Galway's, and one of Cork's belong to that order. The Catholic College has won first place in no fewer than nine subjects.* Among these distinctions we are glad to see all the first places in

	1889						1890						1891						1892					
	1st Arts		2d Arts		B.A.		1st Arts		2d Arts		B.A.		1st Arts		2d Arts		B.A.		1st Arts		2d Arts		B.A.	
	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors
Queen's Coll., Belfast	8	25	7	23	7	12	10	30	8	22	8	15	26	67	7	33	5	14	9	28	7	16	6	13
Queen's Coll., Cork	0	00	3	6	0	1	1	3	0	0	4	5	5	8	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	1
Queen's Coll., Galway	3	10	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	6	3	3	5	13	1	3	3	4	1	4	2	5	1	5
Univ. Coll., Dublin	3	14	4	18	1	3	5	13	6	14	5	9	16	38	6	22	3	8	5	20	6	18	5	9
	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors
	22	60	17	54	9	17	7	17	4	23	4	10	15	50	5	16	8	11	8	17	5	17	6	11
	3	10	5	17	3	5	0	1	2	7	1	5	3	9	1	7	3	4	0	1	0	1	1	1
	3	5	2	10	3	4	4	15	2	7	1	3	3	27	3	8	4	5	1	4	1	4	2	4
	5	18	6	23	2	4	11	34	5	16	6	10	22	60	7	37	2	4	10	25	7	25	7	8
	1889						1890						1891						1892					
	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors	Exhibit's	Honors
Queen's Coll., Belfast	22	60	26	67	17	65	22	57	79	17	54	71	15	50	65	21	50	71	19	45	64
Queen's Coll., Cork	3	10	5	8	13	5	9	14	1	6	7	5	17	22	3	9	12	4	11	15	1	2	3
Queen's Coll., Galway	3	12	6	13	19	6	13	19	4	14	18	8	19	27	9	27	36	7	17	24	3	9	12
Univ. Coll., Dublin	8	35	16	30	52	13	38	51	16	47	63	13	45	58	22	60	82	17	57	74	24	58	82	

science in both examinations. Belfast has gained only three first places, Galway two and Cork none. But it is now a mere insult to University College, Dublin, to measure it with those two latter. The Arts Faculty in Cork, as a school of distinction in classics, modern literature and pure science, is moribund. Not even the present annual waste of public money upon it can keep it alive; and the funds would be better spent upon the Munster Dairy School and Agricultural Institute. Some value might then be derived by the locality from the money.

"The tale of Catholic successes is not confined to the story of one great Catholic College. Thus the colleges for the higher education of Catholic girls, absolutely unassisted as they are, now equal or surpass in efficiency the two Queen's Colleges in Galway and Cork. St. Mary's University College has won a total of seventeen distinctions, while Galway, with its ten thousand pounds a year, has gained only eighteen, and Cork only six. The rapid rise of this institution is one of the most gratifying educational achievements in Catholic Ireland within recent years. Though only in its infancy it has already taken its rank as one of the first educational institutions in Ireland. It ties this year with Alexandra College in the total of its University distinctions, and is rapidly gaining upon that other most successful girls' college, the Victoria College, Belfast. The Loretto College, St. Stephen's Green, has also proved its quality, gaining eleven distinctions and the Hutchenson-Stewart Prize, or twice as many honors as have been won by the Students of the Queen's College, Cork. A college of the Catholic University whose prominence will be noted with special satisfaction this year, is the Holy Cross College, Clonliffe. It has won two first places, six first class distinctions and four second class. In the Second Arts Examination, Clonliffe has won five times as many distinctions as the Cork Queen's College. How long in the face of such results as these are effete secular institutions like those which have been vainly maintained in Cork and Galway, to be allowed to monopolise the endowments granted out of Irish taxes for higher education? If the Queen's Colleges

were among the most successful university colleges in the world, the denial of the Catholic claims in the matter of higher education *would be a monstrous injustice. But in face of the ridiculous fiasco in which Sir Robert Peel's policy has ended, the injustice becomes a glaring public scandal, and the maintenance of such institutions* out of Irish money a corrupt job as well."

These figures show the gradual progress of University College from the position of a good second to a successful lead. Belfast College with its splendid body of teachers and numerous prizes attracts all the clever Protestant and Presbyterian youth of Ulster, and wins the well-deserved reward of its usefulness. University College, though its student roll is so much smaller, and though it is unable like the Queen's College to open its doors to boys of slender means, has all along maintained a good second place and eventually outstripped its wealthy rival. The position of the other two colleges is hardly second rate. Their staff of professors is as able as could be found in any of the great English university colleges, they have prizes which relieve the cost of study for practically every single art student at their lectures, and yet they can show hardly any good results for the $85,000 a year of public money that is divided between them.

The successes attributed above to University College, Dublin, are still more creditable when examined in detail and establish its superiority in a more marked manner. In the introductory examinations they include in many cases the first place in various subjects, and the first in the aggregate of the whole examination. To instance only the last two years which are not at all exceptionally superior to earlier ones, we find that in 1895, University College students obtained: In the First Arts Examination, the first place in Latin, in English and mathematics, and the first exhibition in the total of marks; and in Second Arts, the first and second places in Latin, Greek, English and physics, the first place in Celtic, mathematics, chemistry and biology, and the first, second and fourth exhibitions; while in 1896, they secured in the First Arts the first and second places in Latin,

mathematics and physics, the first place in Greek and the first, second, third, fourth and sixth exhibitions, and in the Second Arts the first place in Latin, Greek, English and biology, the first and second in mathematics and physics, the first, second, third and fourth in logic, and the first, second fourth and sixth exhibitions.

The following comparison of the honors won by each institution at last year's examinations will illustrate the great superiority in value of those obtained by University College. The honors awarded to a student's answering in any subject are divided into "first class" or "second class honors," according as they pass or fall below a very high standard of excellence. There are also two grades in the exhibitions: "first class" exhibitions varying with the examination from $150 to $168 are granted to the first seven or ten students on the list, and "second class" exhibitions of half the value, to the next fifteen or twenty students. It will be seen that the distinctions of University College are of much higher quality than those of the other colleges.

1896.

	First Arts.				Second Arts.				B. A. Degree.			
	Exhibitions		Honors		Exhibitions		Honors		Exhibitions		Honors	
	1st Class.	2d Class.	1st Class.	2d Class.	1st Class.	2d Class.	1st Class.	2d Class.	1st Class.	2d Class.	1st Class.	2d Class.
University Col., Dublin,	7	3	11	14	5	2	10	15	4	3	5	3
Queen's " Belfast,	2	6	1	16	1	4	7	10	1	5	1	10
" " Cork....	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
" " Galway	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	2	0	4

JUNE, 1897.

FIRST ARTS OR FIRST UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS.

	Exhibitions			Honors			Total Distinctions
	1st Class.	2d Class.	Total.	1st Class.	2d Class.	Total.	
University College, Dublin . .	5	2	7	11	9	20	27
Queen's " Belfast . .	3	6	9	7	10	17	26
" " Galway . .	1	1	2	4	3	7	9
" " Cork . . .	1	0	1	0	3	3	4

SECOND ARTS OR SECOND UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS.

	Exhibitions			Honors			
	1st Class.	2d Class.	Total.	1st Class.	2d Class.	Total.	Total Distinctions
University College, Dublin . .	4	1	5	12	7	19	24
Queen's " Belfast . .	1	4	5	5	10	15	20
" " Galway. .	0	0	0	3	6	9	9
" " Cork . . .	0	1	1	0	1	1	2

I–II ARTS COMBINED.

	1st Class. Honor Exhib.	2d Class. Honor Exhib.	Total Distinctions
University College, Dublin . .	32	19	51
Queen's " Belfast . .	16	30	46
" " Galway. .	8	10	18
" " Cork . . .	1	5	6

In these two examinations University College won first place in Ireland (*i. e.*, first exhibition, first in the aggregate of all subjects), and in First Arts, first place in mathematics, physics and English, and in Second Arts, first place in Greek, French, Celtic, mathematics, mathematical physics and experimental physics—nine first places in subjects, while Queen's College, Belfast, got first in three.

Of the places won in the B. A. degree examination since 1890, University College carried off, in 1890, first in mathematics, first and third in biology; in 1891, second and third in history and political science; in 1892, first, second and fourth in mental science, and second in mathematics; in 1893, first in classics; in 1894, first, second and third in classics, with the rare distinction of a gold medal for excellence in answering; second, and third in mental science and second in mathematics; in 1895, second in classics, political science and mathematics; and in 1896, first and second in classics; first, second and third in mental science; second in political science, and first in physics.

In the M. A. degree, which is regarded as entirely an honors examination, University College secured during the same years: in 1890, first place in mathematics; in 1891,

first in modern literature, and first in biological science; in 1892, first, second, and third places in mental science; in 1893, first in mental science; second and third in political science, and first in mathematics, with a gold medal for highly distinguished answering; in 1894, first in modern literature, and first in mental science; in 1895, first, third, and fourth in classics; first in political science, and second in mental science and in mathematics; and in 1896, first place in classics, and first in mental science.

There are at present five studentships of $1,500 each offered every year to students of M. A. standing, but some years back there were at times only two available. Of the thirty that have been granted during the eight years we have been studying, University College obtained eleven, Belfast Queen's College twelve, Galway two, and Cork none.

Such is a brief survey of the educational work of University College. It is, indeed, a record in which all Catholic Irishmen should feel pride, and which its past students regard with the warmest gratification. Its success is the best evidence of what Irish talent and Irish power of application can do if it only got opportunity of development and a field for its exercise; but it is also a testimony to the ability and devotion of the teaching staff which all outsiders recognize but none can appreciate so well as the old students. The professors are partly Ecclesiastics and partly Catholic laymen. The former are members of the Jesuit Order whose reputation for learning is not confined to Ireland and whose character and kindly influence are felt at other than class times; and supply in some way the want of a residential university. The lay professors are mostly young men, past students of the college (of whom four have been already elected Fellows of the University); and are rapidly gaining a high place in the list of gifted Irish scholars.

It is a strange anomaly that a college capable of obtaining such results each year, and performing such a splendid part in the work of Irish education, should be left without recognition or assistance from the State, whilst so much of public money should be wasted each year on Cork and Galway

Queen's Colleges without their ever being able to show any return for it, either in education imparted or honors gained.

The endowments of Trinity College constitute, of course, a much graver inequality. The enormous rental of the confiscated estates which James I. settled on it three hundred years ago and the innumerable bequests and donations it has since received, make its corporation one of the wealthiest educational bodies in the world and enable it to afford its students both the choicest culture and the deepest research that Ireland can produce. Its yearly revenue, beside which the $225,000 of the Queen's Colleges and Royal University seem a beggarly allowance, maintains scores of Fellows and tutors in luxurious incomes, provides prizes and free scholarships without end for its students, in addition to the benefits of university life, and keeps up the perfect equipment of the magnificent libraries and museums which so many public sources have enriched.

All this is the preserve of the small Protestant minority, and the Catholics, the great majority of the nation, stand empty-handed without.

It is true the endowments of Trinity College are now private property, with which Parliament could not interfere, and it may seem but a sentimental grievance to air our inferiority to it; but having regard to the duty which government everywhere recognizes, of encouraging and providing education, it would be no improper use of the public funds to divert a large sum toward lessening the enormous disparity between the position of Catholic and Protestant education in Ireland.

It would, however, be a very simple matter to settle the injustice of the present Queen's College system and give Catholics the same assistance as non-Catholics in their preparation for the Royal University; and no stronger claim for their rights could be made than the exhibition which University College, Dublin, yearly gives of their hard-earned success in the face of such heavy odds.

This is but a faint picture of one side of the story of Catholic Ireland, even in our day, when the nations think

that with Catholic emancipation and the death of penal laws, we are breathing the freedom of the boasted English Constitution. It is well to emphasize it and we have intentionally repeated ourselves to do so. Catholic Ireland robbed for Protestant endowments! Catholic Ireland taxed to pay by the pennies of her poor for Godless education! This, too, in the face of the awful revelation of national robbery by overtaxation, which has lately startled the conscience of the Christian world! Catholic Ireland thus treated by a people to whose ancestors, aye, and to the princes of whose blood, she opened her schools, her home and her heart, in the golden years when she was the light and the generous benefactor of Western Christendom. But she is not faint-hearted—not less brave and hopeful now than in her dark centuries past. She will continue to cry and to struggle for justice, and she must be heard, she must succeed. She must have her parliament and her school and her altar despite the power of tyrants and the selfish bigotry of a foreign church.

I cannot close this imperfect outline of the present position of our Catholic education, its struggles, its triumphs and its hopes, more fittingly than by the eloquent words of the Rev. Father Carbery, S. J., then Rector of the Catholic University, before the Maynooth Union of '96. His theme is "Higher Education our Hope for the Future," and he dwells with loving emphasis on the prophetic words of Cardinal Newman relating to the future of education in Ireland:

"There are few of us," he says, "who have not read and reread, lingering over the page with speculation as to its prophetic weight, Cardinal Newman's conception of our country, once again a great centre of Catholic education. Dear to him as was his own Oxford, with the memories of its associations and friendships of early manhood, as well as of his wondrous influence in later days, when the *élite* of the university crowded around him at St. Mary's, as an apostle of the higher life; despite these natural prepossessions, and even contemplating his Alma Mater in the full accomplishment of his daily prayer, that the lamp of faith might once

again light up her shrines, he could not think it possible, when he brought his philosophic mind to bear on his profound historical knowledge, that it would be given to her to resume the high position which she had forfeited by her fall, as the second great school of learning in the Church of God.

"'Since the age of Alfred and the first Henry,' he writes, 'the world has grown from the west and south of Europe into four or five continents; and I look for a city less inland than that old sanctuary, and a country closer upon the highway of the sea. I look toward a land both old and young; old in its Christianity, young in the promise of the future; a nation which received grace before the Saxon came to Britain and which has never quenched it. I contemplate a people which had a long night, and will have an inevitable day. The capital of that hopeful land is situated on a beautiful bay, near a romantic region; and in it I see a flourishing university, which for a while had to struggle with fortune, but which when its first founders were dead and gone, had success far exceeding their anxieties. Hither as to a sacred soil, the home of their fathers and the fountain head of their Christianity, students are flocking from east, west and south with the ease and rapidity of a locomotion not yet discovered; all speaking one tongue, all owning one faith, all eager for one large, true wisdom; and thence when their stay is over, going back again to carry peace to men of good will over all the earth.'

"The well known characteristics of the author of this prediction; his scrupulous reverence for truth, his dread of all exaggeration and deceit, no less than his power of logical deduction, should suffice to secure attention for any pronouncement of his own on such an important subject. But when, moreover, we calmly consider the reasons so skilfully insinuated as the basis of this conviction we find our own views gradually expand into a strong faith that, if the Catholics of Ireland are but true to themselves this prediction will be fully realized."

JOSEPH DOLAN, M.A.

Ardee, Co. Louth.

AMERICAN FOUNDATIONS OF RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

THE SISTERS OF CHARITY IN THE UNITED STATES.

(*Second Part.*)

ON February 20, 1810, the new house which Mother Seton had undertaken to build was sufficiently near its completion to allow the Sisters to occupy part of it. Two days later they opened a day school for girls living in and near Emmettsburg. By the middle of May they had five boarding pupils; in June, the total number of students was forty; and at the close of the year the boarders alone numbered thirty. The original design had been to have a school for only poor children, but the lack of sufficient means compelled the Sisters to make a beginning by devoting their services chiefly to the education of daughters of the well-to-do. As the institution made progress, postulants applied for admission. In May, Mother Seton wrote to a friend: "We are now twelve, and as many again are waiting for admission. I have a very, very large school to superintend every day, and the entire charge of the religious instruction of all the country round. All apply to the Sisters of Charity, who are day and night devoted to the sick and the ignorant."

Cecilia Seton, who joined the community shortly after it had moved to Emmettsburg, died in April, 1810, and was buried beside her sister Harriet.

Although a certain amount of revenue could be counted upon from the pupils, from contributions offered by persons in sympathy with the objects of the sisterhood, and from the generosity of the Filicchi brothers, the community had to sustain the debt for its new building; this, together with the furnishing and maintenance of the establishment soon brought on financial straits. At first it was proposed that Mother Seton should go on a tour of the country soliciting aid; but this project was condemned. To avert the sale of the property for debt and the destruction of the institute, appeals were made by letter in December, 1811, to a number

of persons well disposed towards the community, such as Gen. Robert Goodloe Harper, son-in-law of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and others through whose assistance the impending necessity of abandoning their work of charity was warded off.

When Mother Seton and her advisers failed in their effort to induce the institute of the Daughters of Charity in France to send some members to America who might aid in the formation of a permanent religious community here, according to the rule of St. Vincent de Paul, they acted upon their own counsel, making use of the plan drawn up by the saint for the direction of the religious. In his edifying *Life of Mrs. Eliza A. Seton*, the Rev. Dr. Charles I. White makes this summary of the regulations then laid down, which proved a solid basis for virtues and good works during forty years:

"The end which the Sisters of Charity proposed to themselves was to honor our Lord Jesus Christ as the source and model of all charity, by rendering to Him every temporal and spiritual service in their power, in the persons of the poor, the sick, prisoners, and others; also to honor the sacred infancy of Jesus Christ in the young persons of their sex whom they may be called upon to form to virtue, while they sow in their minds the seed of useful knowledge. Thus the poor, of all descriptions and ages, the sick, invalids, foundlings, orphans, and even insane persons, were embraced within the sphere of their solicitude and care.

"Another object of their zeal, no less important at that time in America, was the instruction of young persons of their sex in virtue, piety, and various branches of useful learning. This instruction they were to extend gratis to poor orphans, as far as circumstances would permit. The education of female youth in general did not enter into the plan contemplated by St. Vincent de Paul. On the one hand, the great facilities which France and other parts of Europe offered for the instruction of young ladies in the knowledge and accomplishments of their sex, made it needless for the good of society; while, on the other, the liberal

endowments by which his spiritual daughters were enabled to pursue their charitable labors, dispensed them from the necessity of earning the means of support. But the case was very different in the United States. The superiors of St. Joseph's community thought it essential to the very existence of the society that it should embrace in its object the education of young ladies who were able to pay for their instruction, as without this its resources would be insufficient for the maintenance of the mother-house and an orphan asylum. Moreover, this modification of the rules of St. Vincent appeared the more desirable, as it would extend the benefits of religious instruction to a class of society which has the greatest influence upon public morals, and which then possessed but scanty facilities in the United States for obtaining a solid and virtuous education.

"To carry out the above-mentioned objects, the society is composed of such as were never married and of widows, who are required to be sound of mind and body, and free from all defects that would prevent them from discharging the functions of their state. They must be of good character and respectable connections, of an age commonly not short of sixteen nor exceeding twenty-eight, and, above all, fully disposed to serve God during their whole life in the persons of the poor and the education of youth, with an entire submission to the guidance of superiors and a great fidelity to the rules of the institute.

"Candidates for admission into the Sisterhood are permitted, after mature deliberation, to enter the novitiate, or term of probation, during which they are instructed particularly in the duties and spirit of their vocation. At the expiration of this period, if judged competent by the superiors, they are allowed to make the simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and permanency in the company, according to their rules, and this for one year only, conformably to the practice of the community. These vows are intended to check the inconstancy of the human mind and to prevent a hasty return to the world which might be followed by regret and remorse; but, as they bind only for a period of

twelve months, the Sisters are at liberty to withdraw at the expiration of this time, though they are supposed to make their vows in the first instance with a determination to remain during their whole life in their holy vocation.

"As nothing could be more excellent and sublime than the end contemplated by the Sisterhood of St. Joseph's, the most perfect dispositions are required in its members, and the rules prescribed for their observance tend no less to their own personal sanctification than to their preparation for the service of the neighbor. That they may correspond with the grace of their vocation and fulfill with merit to themselves and benefit to others the great obligations annexed to it, they are strenuously exhorted to the practice of holiness, to aim at Christian perfection, and to join the exercises of an interior and spiritual life with their exterior employments, according to the regulations of the institute, the faithful observance of which is considered the most effectual means of attaining the ends of their holy state. Though they do not belong to a religious order (such a state being incompatible with the objects of their society), yet, as they are more exposed to the world than members of a religious order, having in most circumstances no other monastery than the houses of the sick or the school-room, no other cell than a rented apartment, no other chapel than the parish church, no cloister but the public street or hospital, no enclosure but obedience, no grate but the fear of God, no veil but that of holy modesty, they are taught to aim at the highest virtue and to comport themselves under all circumstances with as much edification as if they were living in the seclusion of a convent. The salvation of their soul is the paramount consideration they are to have in view. The cultivation of humility, charity and simplicity, the performance of their actions in union with the Son of God, contempt of the world, disengagement from created things, love of abjection, patient and even cheerful endurance of all earthly crosses and trials, and a great confidence in Divine Providence, are practices which the sisters consider essential to their profession.

"In addition to these holy maxims, which may be said to form the characteristic spirit of the society, the sisters are animated in a special manner by the requirements of the holy vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, to pursue with zeal the objects of their institute. The most admirable rules are laid down for the practice of mutual charity among themselves, and also for the proper fulfilment of the duties that may be assigned to them, whether attending the sick in hospitals and private houses, conducting free schools and asylums, or discharging other offices of their state. The dangers to be met with in various situations are pointed out, as well as the precautions to be adopted. In a word, no instruction is omitted that could tend to qualify the Sister of Charity for the worthy and successful performance of her high functions.

"But as she would in vain hope to acquit herself faithfully of these onerous duties, and in that proper spirit which they demand, without the assiduous exercise of prayer and reflection, a strict attention is required to various practices of piety, such as morning and evening prayer, meditation, spiritual reading, self-examination, frequentation of the Sacraments, and other devotions, which tend to enkindle in the soul the love of God and the neighbor, to nourish the spirit of faith, and to maintain a perpetual triumph of grace over the weakness of nature and the suggestions of the world. In any of the situations in which a sister may be employed, whether at the mother-house or on the missions, a large portion of her daily time is appropriated to prayer and other spiritual exercises, while the remainder is filled up with the duties of her calling.

"The power and authority which were necessary to maintain the spirit of the institute, to insure its objects and regulate its various operations, were vested in a central government, composed of a superior-general (who is a clergyman), a mother-superior, an assistant, a treasurer and a procuratrix. The superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpitius, in Baltimore, was *ex officio* protector of the Constitution of the society and had an eye to their faithful observance. The

superior-general was to be consulted on all important matters, both temporal and spiritual. The Mother-Superior was to exercise a more immediate supervision over affairs, and particularly over the principal establishment in which she resides. To be eligible to this office, it was required that a sister should be thirty-five years of age and have been a member of the community twelve years; moreover, that she should possess a mature judgment, with the talent of governing, and, above all, be exemplary in the practice of the different virtues which the vocation of a Sister of Charity demands. The mother was to be elected in a general assembly of the sisters, by a majority of votes, for a term of three years and could be reëlected a second term, but not longer. The offices of assistant, treasurer and procuratrix were also to be conferred by a majority of votes, and for only one term of three years. These officers formed the council of the mother and to their joint deliberation were referred all matters relating to the interests of the company. Besides the mother and her council, there was a mistress of novices in the principal house, appointed by the mother with the aid of her advisers, to form those who were admitted into the Sisterhood to the spirit and duties of their vocation. One of the sisters was also appointed, in the same way, to regulate and superintend the exercises of St. Joseph's Academy. The establishments abroad have each a presiding officer to watch over its concerns, who was appointed by the same authority and is called the sister-servant. All other inferior offices are distributed by the mother, according to her judgment and discretion."

Mother Seton's children were an obstacle to her taking the obligations of the religious state. She had no competence for them, and she would not give up to any one else her maternal duty as their guardian. Some of the Sulpician Fathers who helped to fashion the new institute thought indeed that she ought to quit the community, return to Baltimore, and re-open her private school. But others of them contended that she was where God had clearly sent her, and that exceptional provision should be made for her. She

submitted the difficulty to those interested in her work, especially to her spiritual director, and finally to the decision of Archbishop Carroll. In a letter written to her on September 11, 1811, he said :

"Honored and dear Madam :—Shall I confess that I am deeply humiliated at being called on to give a final sanction to a rule of conduct and plan of religious government by which it is intended to promote and preserve, among many beloved spouses of Jesus Christ, a spirit of solid and sublime religious perfection? When I remember how many prayers, fastings, watchings, etc., were employed by the holy founders of religious institutions to obtain light and assistance from the Holy Ghost to render their Constitutions and rules adapted to the objects of their pious zeal, I am so sensible of my unworthiness that I would certainly decline from the task if I did not entertain a confidence that it may please God to bestow a blessing on the ministerial acts of the ministers of religion whom He has constituted, to which blessing they are not entitled if only their private worth were considered. Under this impression, therefore, I shall and do now give my approbation to the Constitutions exhibited to me by Mr. Dubois, after they shall receive the alterations suggested to and by him. You will know from him what these are ; and it affords me great pleasure to learn that all the material points, on which a difference of opinion was thought to exist, have been given up by Messrs. de St. Sulpice in their last deliberations. If they had not, I do not think that I should have approved the Constitutions as modified in the copy thereof which has been before me. Mr. Dubois has not exhibited the rules of detail and particular duties of the sisters ; but these being matters of which yourselves and your father-superior will be the best judges, I commit you and them with the utmost confidence to the guidance of the Divine Spirit. I am exceedingly anxious that every allowance shall be made, not only to the sisters generally but to each one in particular, which can serve to give quiet to their consciences, provided that this be done without endangering the harmony of the community ; and therefore it must become a matter of regulation. I am rejoiced likewise to know that the idea of any other connection than of charity is abandoned between the daughters of St. Joseph and the Society of St. Sulpice ; I mean that their interests, administration, and government are not to be the

same, or, at least, under the same control. This removes many inconveniences for you and for Messrs. of St. Sulpice. No one of that body but your immediate superior, residing near you, will have any share in the government or concerns of the sisters, except (on very rare and uncommon occasions) the superior of the Seminary of Baltimore, but not his Society. This, however, is to be understood so as not to exclude the essential superintendence and control of the Archbishop over every community in his diocese. Your own peculiar situation required special consideration on account of your dear children. It seemed to me that only general principles for you and your family's case should be now established, grounded on justice and gratitude; and that special considerations should be deferred to the period when the circumstances may require them. At present too many persons would be consulted and, among them, some who are incompetent to judge; and even they who are most competent might find their most equitable provisions rendered useless by the changes produced in a few years. Mr. Dubois has been very explicit in communicating, I believe, whatever it was proper for me to know. On my side, it has been my endeavor, when I read the Constitutions, to consult, in the first place, the individual happiness of your dear sisters, and, consequently, your own; secondly, to render their plan of life useful to religion and the public; thirdly, to confine the administration of your own affairs and the internal and domestic government, as much as possible, to your own institutions once adopted, and within your own walls. Your superior or confessor alone need be informed or consulted in matters where the mother and her council need advice. I shall congratulate you and your beloved sisters when the Constitution is adopted. It will be like freeing you from a state in which it was difficult to walk straight, as you had no certain way in which to proceed. In the meantime, assure yourself and them of my utmost solicitude for your advancement in the service and favor of God; of my reliance on your prayers; of mine for your prosperity in the important duty of education, which will and must long be your principle, and will always be your partial, employment. A century at least will pass before the exigencies and habits of this country will require, and hardly admit, of the charitable exercises towards the sick sufficient to employ any number of the sisters out of our largest cities; and therefore they must consider the business of education as a laborious, charitable, and permanent object of their religious duty."

In accordance with the Archbishop's views, the case of Mother Seton was treated as exceptional in the Constitutions of the new religious institute. A clause authorizing her to watch over her children's welfare and to administer their property was added in the paragraph regarding the admission of widows. It was also provided in her favor that in case of her election to the office of mother-superior for more than two consecutive terms the choice might be ratified, provided the ecclesiastical directors of the society should deem her continuance in office beneficial for the general good.

When the new rules were read to the Emmettsburg community in January, 1812, the sisters were notified that they were free to accept them by remaining in the society, or if they felt any difficulty of doing so they could return to their respective homes. There were twenty sisters in the house. Only one of them decided to go away.

Having been adopted by the community, the Constitutions were then once more referred to the superior of the Sulpicians, the Rev. John Tessier, and to the Most Rev. John Carroll for formal canonical approval. On January 17th, the Archbishop sent the approbation in writing, adding these words: "I have approved of the same, believing them to be inspired by the Spirit of God and suitable to conduct the Sisters to religious perfection."

Father John Dubois (then a Sulpician and later Bishop of New York) was appointed the first Superior-General of the Sisterhood.

An election was at once held. Mrs. Seton was chosen Mother-Superior; Mrs. Rose White, Assistant; Miss Catharine Mullen, Treasurer, and Miss Ann Gruber, Procuratrix.

The sisters entered a spiritual retreat on February 2, 1812, and were then informed that a further novitiate of one year would be allowed them to test their vocation under the new rule, at the expiration of which additional period of trial, they could either take the vows or withdraw, as they should prefer and the superiors should decide.

No special habit was required by the Constitutions; that being one of the details postponed for further consideration.

Meanwhile the sisters were directed to wear the costume that they had used since the commencement of the institute. "It may be remarked, however," says Dr. White, "that for some years neither the form nor the material of the community dress had a very definite character. Some weeks after the sisters were established in the valley, the black cap was introduced and afterward retained. The color of the dress, as well as the material, was not very uniform. The straightened funds of the house required the observance of a very rigid economy, and for this reason habits for the sisters were frequently made from the articles of clothing which they had brought with them to the institution. In the year 1812, one piece of linsey, pepper and salt color, was purchased for the community, and the habits manufactured from this stuff were considered by the members of the house as remarkably genteel, compared with others then in use. We may judge, however, that they scarcely reached the proper standard from a humorous observation of Bishop Cheverus, who, seeing one of the sisters in her linsey habit, inquired of Mother Seton if she was 'under penance.' At a later period, when the income of the establishment had increased, black bombazette was introduced for the habits of the sisters; but during the war between Great Britain and the United States, in consequence of the difficulty of procuring this article, flannel was substituted in its place, and was used afterward, winter and summer."

During that first year of the community's existence as a regular institute ten postulants were received.

Sister Annina Seton, the Mother-Superior's eldest child, fell ill in September, 1811, and died on the following March 12, in the seventeenth year of her age, beloved in life and mourned and envied in her pious death.

At the end of the year of probation, on July 19, 1813, these following members of the community, eighteen in all, took the vows: Eliza Ann Seton, Rose White, Catharine Mullen, Ann Gruber, Elizabeth Boyle, Angela Brady, Cecilia O'Conway, Susan Clossy, Mary Ann Butler, Adele Salva, Louise Roger, Margaret George, Sarah Thompson, Eleanor Thomp-

son, Martina Quinn, Fanny Jordan, Teresa Conway and Julia Shirk.

A novitiate was started in August, with Sister Catharine Mullen as novice mistress, and this completed the organization of the society.

The first colony from St. Joseph's was sent to Philadelphia in September, 1814, to take charge of an orphan asylum. Three sisters, at the head of whom was Sister Rose White, made up the new foundation which was placed under the patronage of St. Joseph. Beginning in want almost of the necessaries of life, it has developed into a magnificent institution.

The second corps was sent out in 1815. It too consisted of three sisters, who were to take charge of the domestic arrangements of Mt. St. Mary's College.

The third branch was established in New York in 1817, at the request of Bishop Connolly. It, likewise, was composed of three sisters—Rose White (transferred from Philadelphia), Cecilia O'Conway and Felicité Brady. It was anticipated that these would have a more than ordinarily difficult position, owing to the scrutiny and criticism to which they were likely to be subjected in the native city of Mother Seton, a fact which largely influenced Mother Seton in her particular choice of these pioneers.

The Sisterhood was incorporated in January, 1817, by Act of the Legislature of Maryland. There were bigots in those days, for the vote stood 35 to 24, a majority of only 11 in 59 for a philanthropic institution, such as that of pious and cultivated women devoted to education and charity.

Almost from the start, some poor children were freely taught at St. Joseph's, and a number of others were instructed for next to nothing, according to the means of their parents. In 1820 a two-story brick building was erected for a free school, according to the intention of the Rev. Father Cooper, and the children who attended it were not only instructed gratuitously, but they were also fed at noon.

Mother Seton, who had been called in 1815 to a second term as Mother-Superior, was chosen for the third time in

1818. Her health was so poor at the time that she herself called this "an election of the dead." Still she was up and about until 1820. Then the symptoms of consumption showed themselves plainly in her system. For four months she was confined to her room. Her last days were full of edification for the Sisterhood. She expired on January 4, 1821, in the forty-seventh year of her age.

Since Mother Seton's death the work that she began in poverty and uncertainty has developed into noble proportions. The tree she planted has stretched out its branches until they ramify all over the country—through New England in the East, New York in the North, Louisiana in the South, California in the far West, and the vast region between those points. There have grown up under its shade numberless souls walking the paths of religious perfection. It has fed and sheltered hundreds of thousands of persons—infants, orphans, young girls, mothers, the sick, the insane, the leprous—by the practice in their regard of almost all the spiritual and corporal works of mercy. Thus have been fulfilled the prophetic expectations of Bishop Cheverus and Dr. Matignon that this foundress would be "a great good in the United States." A living argument in favor of the Catholic religion, the institute has been of inestimable help to the Church, inside and outside of the communion of the faithful.

Although the Sisterhood of Charity is ready to render every temporal and spiritual service, according to its particular scope, to all who are in need of succor, its special care and affection are extended to the poor and the ignorant. But wherever there is most danger, most discomfort, most forlorn wretchedness, most hope of giving glory to God and doing good to mankind, there its members are at home. In 1832, for instance, when the scourge of the Asiatic cholera swept over our land decimating the population, when thousands fled before its approach, leaving behind them their dying kindred and dearest friends, the Sisters of Charity bravely confronted it. The municipal authorities of Philadelphia were the first who applied to the superioress for aid, and no sooner was the request presented than thirteen of these heroic

nuns were despatched to that city, eager to help and serve those from whom the rest of the world seemed to fly with horror. The scene at the mother-house on this occasion was sublime. The council having assembled, there was no delay in arriving at a favorable determination. A selection was at once made of those who were to start. Their countenances, beaming with joy, gave evidence of the spirit which animated them, and those who remained behind experienced a feeling akin to envy for those upon whom the happy lot had fallen. The City of Baltimore made a similar appeal to obtain nurses for its cholera hospitals, and its petition was also promptly answered. Several of the sisters fell martyrs of the plague. When the epidemic was over and the surviving nuns were recalled, the Board of Guardians of the Almshouse at Philadelphia, at their meeting on May 20, 1833, adopted a series of resolutions expressing their sense of admiration and gratitude in permanent testimony "to the zeal, fidelity and disinterestedness which these amiable philanthropists have exhibited." The authorities of Philadelphia regretted that the sisters would take no reward, "as it would give them pleasure to bestow such a testimonial as might serve partially to express the grateful feelings which they entertain." The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore adopted a resolution testifying that during the pestilence "the Sisters of Charity were conspicuous in the labor of love, as strangers flying to our succor in distress and encountering death as the price of their devotion." "As a memorial of the gratitude of the city," it was determined by the Council that "a monument be erected to the memory of the said deceased Sisters as a record of, and a just tribute to, their exemplary piety, humanity and self-devotion." This monument was placed by the city in the Cathedral Cemetery.

Again, when the Civil War desolated the republic, bands of Sisters of Charity went out from peaceful convent homes to battlefields and military hospitals, and nursed the wounded soldiers confided to their care. They faced hardship, exposure, endless exertion and risk of life, but no thought of pain or privation or peril weakened their devotion in their mi-

nistry of mercy. The sisters remaining in their own hospitals in Washington, St. Louis and other places, devoted themselves with equal zeal and charity to the same Christian and patriotic work. Of the 785 sisters then in the Order, about one-half were engaged during the period from 1861 to 1865, in the service of sick and wounded soldiers.

Once more, when Louisiana gathered together the lepers within its borders in 1896, and established a lazaretto for their shelter, it could find no secular nurses to undertake the loathsome and dangerous task of caring for those living corpses. It sent a petition to the Sisters of Charity, and they promptly accepted the charge.

The institutions conducted by the Sisters of Charity in the United States at the present time number 114. Among them are 12 infant asylums, 10 maternity homes, 26 orphanages, 7 houses of industry, 30 day (parochial) schools, 3 academies, 32 hospitals, 5 insane asylums and 1 institute for lepers.

The sisters last year had under their care 4,967 infants and 6,359 orphans; they instructed 9,223 pupils, nursed 29,504 sick, tended 2,077 insane and cared for 27 lepers.

The community in the United States numbers about 1,500 sisters, with some 50 novices.

One of the dreams of Mother Seton and Bishop Dubourg was made a reality in 1850, when the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph were united with the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. After many negotiations and much correspondence, this union was finally brought about, and on March 25th of that year, the sisters here renewed their vows in the exact formula used in France. On the 8th of December following, they adopted the habit of the French Sisters, with its white cornette. And since then, like one of the great divisions of a world-wide army, they have marched on, with a spirit of devotion such as inspired their American foundress, to peaceful victories in the service of the Lord.

HYMNS OF ADVENT.

IN THIS paper is given a translation, together with some slight commentary, of the hymns *Creator alme siderum* (Vespers), *Verbum supernum prodiens* (Matins), and *En clara vox redarguit* (Lauds). All three, as found in the Breviary, are revisions of very old hymns, whose age and metrical form have caused them to be ascribed to St. Ambrose and St. Gregory. A lover of antiquarian ruggedness will pass easily over the frequent hiatuses of the rhythms to admire at length the occasional vividness and picturesqueness of the figures and phrases in the older hymns; but however tempting the prospect, we are forced to limit our discussion to the modern texts of our Breviary. These texts, moreover, do not require, although they easily permit, an abundant commentary.

All three take the first advent of Christ as a text for a warning and a prayer anent the second advent. In the first hymn, the fifth stanza commences: "Te deprecamur ultimae Magnum diei judicem"; in the second hymn, the third stanza commences: "Ut cum tribunal Judicis," etc.; and in the third hymn, the fourth stanza commences: "Ut cum secundo fulserit," etc. The first hymn dwells mostly on the majesty of the Word; the second is wholly given to a prayer for light and love; the third is an exhortation to be watchful and penitent.

Two stanzas of the old version of the hymn at vespers are here subjoined in order to illustrate how vastly it has been changed in the modern revision—*ex uno disce omnes* may be said of the three hymns.

I. Conditor alme siderum,
[1] Aeterna lux credentium, [1] Aeterne.
Christe Redemptor omnium,
Exaudi preces supplicum.

II. Qui condolens [2] interitu [2] Imperium (*i. e.*, *per* imperium.)
Mortis perire saeculum,
Salvasti mundum languidum,
Donans [3] reis remedium. [3] Regis.

AD VESPERAS.

Creator alme siderum,
Ætérna lux credéntium,
Jesu, Redémptor ómnium,
Inténde votis súpplicum.

Qui dæmonis ne fráudibus
Periret orbis, impetu
Amóris actus, lánguidi
Mundi medéla factus es.

Commúne qui mundi nefas
Ut expiáres, ad crucem
E Virginis sacràrio
Intácta prodis víctima.

Cujus potéstas glóriæ,
Noménque cum primum sonat,
Et cælites et inferi
Treménte curvántur genu.

Te deprecámur últimæ
Magnum diéi Júdicem,
Armis supérnæ grátiæ
Defénde nos ab hóstibus.

Virtus, honor, laus, glória
Deo Patri cum Fílio,
Sancto simul Paráclito,
In sæculórum sæcula. Amen.

CREATOR ALME SIDERUM.

Creator of the starry skies,
Eternal light of faithful breasts,
Who won'st the prize of Paradise,
List to our behests.

Thou, the world's evil to remove
Lest it should perish utterly,
Did'st, spurred by love, leave Heaven above
To be earth's remedy.

To expiate our common woe,
Thou dost, from Mary's sacred breast,
Stainless as snow a Victim go
Upon the Cross to rest.

"JESUS!" Our lips do scarcely tell
That Name of power and majesty,
Ere all that dwell in heaven or hell
Fall down on trembling knee!

O mighty Judge! whom we shall face
On the last day that earth shall know,—
Our souls embrace with heavenly grace
To shield us from our foe!

Glory and power and honor meet
Unto the Father and the Son;
Like praises greet the Paraclete
While endless ages run! Amen.

AD MATUTINUM.

Verbum supérnum pródiens
E Patris ætérni sinu,
Qui natus orbi súbvenis,
Labénte cursu témporis :

Illúmina nunc péctora,
Tuóque amóre cóncrema,
Ut cor cadúca déserens
Cæli volúptas impleat :

Ut, cum tribúnal Júdicis
Damnábit igni nóxios,
Et vox amica débitum
Vocábit ad cælum pios :

Non esca flammárum nigros
Volvámur inter túrbines,
Vultu Dei sed cómpotes
Cæli fruámur gáudiis.

Patri simúlque Filio,
Tibique, sancte Spiritus,
Sicut fuit, sit júgiter
Sæclum per omne glória. Amen.

VERBUM SUPERNUM PRODIENS.

Supernal Word proceeding from
The eternal Father's breast sublime,
Who, born to succor earth, dost come
In the appointed time:

Illumine now each waiting breast;
Fill it with flames of Thy dear love;
That in our hearts alone may rest
Desire of joys above!

That when to flames the Judgment-seat
Condemns the bad for evil done,
And calls the just in accents sweet
Unto their Heaven won:

We may not feed the hungry flame,
Tossed in the black and whirling pool,
But rather God's dear presence claim
In heavenly pastures cool!

Unto the Father and the Son,
And, Spirit Paraclete, to Thee,
What praise hath been, so be it done
Through all eternity!—Amen.

AD LAUDES.

En clara vox redárguit
Obscúra quæque pérsonans :
Procul fugéntur sómnia :
Ab alto Jesus prómicat.

Mens jam resúrgat tórpida,
Non ámplius jacens humi :
Sidus refúlget jam novum,
Ut tollat omne nóxium.

En Agnus ad nos míttitur
Laxáre gratis débitum :
Omnes simul cum lácrimis
Precémur indulgéntiam.

Ut, cum secúndo fúlserit,
Metúque mundum cínxerit,
Non pro reátu púniat,
Sed nos pius tunc prótegat.

Virtus, honor, laus, glória
Deo Patri cum Fílio,
Sancto simul Paráclito,
In sæculórum sæcula. Amen.

EN CLARA VOX REDARGUIT.

Loud the voice of chanticleer
  Quarrels with the darkling sky:
Let all dreaming disappear—
  Christ beams from on high!

Let the sleepy soul arise,
  Springing from its slumbrous tomb;
Lo! a new Star in the skies
  Banishes the gloom!

For the Lamb to us is sent,
  Freely paying what we owe:
Shall we not with tears lament—
  Pleas for pardon show?

That when He again shall shine,
  Girdling all the earth with fear,
Not our doom He may design,
  But our Hope appear!

Honor, power, glory meet
  To the Father and the Son,
And the Spirit Paraclete,
  While the ages run! Amen.

We have but two comments to make here. The first comment concerns the words of the second hymn: "Non esca flammarum nigros volvamur inter turbines." The flames of hell burn without giving light, say the Fathers. "Conspicient ignem obscurum, urendi quidem in tenebris vim habentem, luce vero destitutum" (Basilius, Hom. in Psal. 33).

St. Jude seems to insinuate the same punishment (i. 6): "And the angels, who kept not their principality, but forsook their own habitation, he hath reserved *under darkness* in everlasting chains unto the judgment of the great day."

The "*nigros*" is illustrated by Milton (Par. Lost, Bk. I., 62, 63):

Yet from those flames
No light, but rather darkness visible . . .

Similarly the "*turbines*" (Par. L., Bk. I., 76, 77):

There the companions of his fall, o'erwhelmed
With floods and whirlwinds of tempestuous fire . .

Our second comment is on the first line of the third hymn: *En clara vox redarguit*, which some interpreters refer to Christ, others to the Baptist, who was the "vox clamantis in deserto" of Isaias (xl. 3). We have translated "*vox clara*" in the most literal manner possible, namely, as *chanticleer*, whose name is descriptive of his *vox clara*. Be the symbolism what it may, it is hardly felicitous to mingle the symbolic with the literal meaning. We are strongly inclined to doubt that the Baptist was at all in the mind of the author of the hymn; for in the unrevised version the line ran, "*Vox clara ecce intonat*," and this is strongly suggestive of the line in the hymn *Aeterne rerum Conditor* which runs:

"Praeco diei jam sonat."

As the *praeco* is the *cock*, it is but fair to translate in the same sense "clara vox."

The scriptural suggestiveness found in many phrases of the three hymns is so obvious as to forbid further illustrative comment.

H. T. Henry.

Overbrook Seminary.

PERMUTATIO STIPENDIORUM MISSARUM.

(CASUS MORALIS.[1])

Lucius, rector celebris cujusdam sanctuarii, quum propria pecunia non abundet, dolens, quod non possit conferre in pios fines missionum inter infideles quarum audierat penuriam et necessitates, videtur sibi industriam artemque invenisse, qua possit.

Colligit enim apud sanctuarium multa stipendia neque pauca dioecesanâ taxâ consuetâ majora, trinarum, sc., marcarum (75 cents), quum consueta taxa sit marca cum dimidia (37½ cents), atque multae etiam Missae fundatae sint pro unius marcae (25 cents) stipendio et hac minore taxa celebrari debeant. Cognovit igitur, multa minoris istius taxae stipendia apud Julium existere. Quem adit, eique proponit haec: Commutabo tecum intentiones Missarum, dabo tibi pro singulis stipendium unius et dimidiae marcae, tuas alio transmittam celebrandas auctis singulis stipendiis etiam usque ad consuetam taxam marcae cum dimidia, nihilominus reservabo e singulis Missarum stipendiis marcas; quo fit, ut annuatim 1,000–1,500 marcas pauperibus missionibus possim elargiri. Julius libens consentit. Sed vix ingenium suum exercuerat Lucius in invenienda arte sine propriis sumptibus succurrendi finibus adeo piis, quum ei a confratre scrupulus injicitur de illicita pactione illicitoque lucro circa Missarum stipendia.

Quapropter examinanda proponitur quaestio: *Licitane an illicita sit Lucii agendi ratio.*

SOLUTIO.

Ad propositam quaestionem recte solvendam videri debet:

I. Quae sit obligatio cum Missae celebratione transferenda transferendi stipendii integri, seu quae prohibitio partis stipendii retinendae.

II. Quae admittantur ab hac prohibitione vel lege exceptiones.

III. Possintne illae exceptiones ad casum nostrum applicari.

Ad I^um^. *R.* 1. Ex Bulla Innoc. XII. haec habentur decreta: "Ac similiter omne damnabile lucrum ab Ecclesia removere

1 Cf. Fascicul. pro mense octobri AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW, p. 428.

volens, prohibet sacerdoti, qui Missam suscepit celebrandam cum certa eleemosyna, ne eandem Missam alteri, parte ejusdem eleemosynae sibi retenta, celebrandum committat." Circa quod quum postea interrogaretur, "An sacerdotes quibus aliquando offertur eleemosyna major solita pro celebratione Missae, debeant dare eandem integram eleemosynam iis quibus Missas celebrandas committunt; an vero satis sit, ut dent celebrantibus eleemosynam consuetam?"—resp. est: "debere absolute integram eleemosynam tribuere sacerdoti celebranti, nec ullam illius partem sibi retinere posse."

R. 2. Quod idem in Const. Benedicti XIV., l. c., ita vetitum esse dicitur "a quolibet sacerdote, stipendio seu eleemosyna majoris pretii pro celebratione Missae a quocunque accepta, non posse alteri sacerdoti Missam hujusmodi celebraturo stipendium seu eleemosynam minoris pretii erogari, etsi eidem sacerdoti Missam celebranti et consentienti se majoris pretii stipendium seu eleemosynam accepisse indicasset."

R. 3. Eadem illa Constitutione Bened. XIV., censurae poena fertur in mercaturam cum Missarum stipendiis, quae nunc statuta est ad normam Const. Pii IX., *Apostolicae Sedis*, quae excommunicatio Romano Pontifici ordinario modo reservata fertur in "colligentes eleemosynas majoris pretii pro Missis et ex iis lucrum captantes, faciendo eas celebrari in locis, ubi Missarum stipendia minoris pretii esse solent": quod per decretum S. Officii a Leone XIII. approbatum d. 13 Jan. 1892, ita extensum est, ut eadem excommunicatio incurratur *etiam ab iis, qui eodem loco, quo collegerunt, pro minore stipendio Missas faciant celebrari.*

R. 4. In decretis d. 13 Aug. 1874 latis, a Pio IX. confirmatis et Ordinariis transmissis habetur ad VII^um^, "An liceat Episcopis sine speciali S. Sedis venia ex eleemosynis Missarum, quas fideles celebrioribus sanctuariis tradere solent, aliquid detrahere, ut eorum decori et ornamento consulatur, quando praesertim ea propriis reditibus careant?" Resp: "Negative, nisi de consensu oblatorum." Quod est inter ea, quae a Leone XIII. novis additis poenis decreto *Vigilanti* confirmata sunt, ita ut *sacerdotibus* contra ea delinquentibus imposita sit ipso facto suspensio a divinis S.

Sedi reservata, *clericis inferioribus* suspensio ab ordinibus susceptis et inhabilitas ad superiores ordines suscipiendos pari modo reservata, *laicis* excommunicatio Episcopis reservata.

Unde patet, legibus positivis naturalem legem in hac re existentem non solum sanciri, sed etiam magis determinari vel extendi etiam ad eas res, quae ex sola lege naturali vix criminis incusari possint sed solum periculum turpiter delinquendi constituant. Quare superfluum videri potest accuratius videre, quid jam naturali lege, quid lege tantum positiva evaserit in nostra re illicitum.

Ad II$^{um.}$, nimirum ad exceptiones ab illa prohibitione jure admissas, transiturus:

R. 1. Prohibitiones retinendi quidquam ex stipendiis Missarum, si quando Missae alteri celebrandae committuntur, respiciunt stipendia manualia, non fundationes Missarum, quae factae sint sive ad sustentandam ecclesiam, sive ad ejus ministrorum sustentationem adeoque eorum salarium vel beneficium constituunt vel supplent atque iis, quae "jura stolae" dicuntur, possunt aequiparari.

Quod in ipsa Constit. Innoc. XII. cautum est. Nam ad quaesitum: "An hoc decretum habeat locum in beneficiis quae conferuntur in titulum, i. e., an rector beneficii qui potest per alium celebrare, teneantur sacerdoti celebranti dare stipendium ad rationem beneficii?" Resp. communicatur: "non habere locum, sed satis esse ut rector beneficii, qui potest Missam per alium celebrare, tribuat sacerdoti celebranti eleemosynam congruam secundum morem civitatis vel provinciae, *nisi in fundatione ipsius beneficii aliud cautum fuerit.*" Haec ad similes fundationes, quae beneficii vel salarii complementum sint extendi, v. Lehmkuhl, *Theol. mor.*, II., n. 204. Imo prodiit resp. S.C.C. in causa Coloniensi d. d. 25 Julii, 1874, ad Quaes. "Utrum pro Missis nuptialibus et exsequialibus, quando parochus eas aliis celebrandas committit, manualem eleemosynam tradere possit, retento pinguiori stipendio ex lege dioecesana illis assignato?" R. "Quum agatur *de juribus stolae*, satis esse, si parochus retribuat celebranti eleemosynam ordinariam." (Cf. *Archiv. fur Kath. Kirchenrecht*, vol. 62, pag. 179.) Quod autem pro extra-

ordinario labore ad ordinariam taxam additur, id sane celebranti cedi debet.

R. 2. Excipitur, etiam quando agitur de stipendiis manualibus, communiter ille casus, quo stipendium consueto majus intuitu ejus, cui stipendium confertur, datum fuerit: ita ut excessus potius pro mero dono personali quam pro parte stipendii Missae haberi debeat. Quam exceptionem S. Alph., l. c., n. 321, referens approbat, atque jure, quia in tali casu non proprie retinetur pars stipendii, sed retinetur quod occasione stipendii pro liberali dono fuerit collatum. Attamen non quilibet excessus supra consuetam taxam pro ejusmodi dono personali haberi potest. Fac enim, eum qui stipendium dat, solere communiter, quia dives est, majora stipendia dare; in quo casu sumi nequit, excessum esse liberale donum quod retineri possit, translata Missae obligatione cum stipendio ordinario.

Quod nostra aetate S. C. C., die 25 Julii, 1874, confirmavit, dicens, integrum stipendium in celebrantem transferendum esse, "nisi morali certitudine constet, excessum communis eleemosynae oblatum fuisse intuitu parochi."

R. 3. Excipitur similiter ille casus, quando ille, in quem cum Missa celebranda stipendium transfertur, sponte sua excessum omnino libere donat. Nam etsi celebraturo totum stipendium jure debeatur, illud tamen, cujus jus sive in re sive ad rem acquisivit, sponte et libere dono donare cuilibet, adeoque etiam committenti sacerdoti, potest. Ita etiam S. Alph., l. c., n. 321. Quod autem supra in Constit. SS. PP. partem retineri non posse dicitur, "etiamsi eidem sacerdoti celebranti et consentienti" id indicetur, ea est ratio, quia ejusmodi consensus roganti seu indicanti datus non censetur omnino sponte et libere datus, quippe qui datus non esset, nisi committens stipendium rogasset atque alter timeret, ne alias omni spe accipiendorum stipendiorum destitueretur.

Ex dictis colligitur, utramvis voluntatem sufficere, ut liceat partem stipendii detrahere: (1) voluntatem ultroneam seu spontaneam ejus cui Missa celebranda demum committitur; (2) voluntatem ejus, qui stipendium largius primo offert.

Generatim quidem in legibus ecclesiasticis, quas attuli, supponitur, eum, qui stipendium acceptum alteri committat diminutum, partem detractam sibi retinere, adeoque finis legis principalis est, ut caveatur a turpi lucro et cum stipendiis Missarum mercatura. Verum ad illum turpem quaestum sibi faciendum lex illa universalis non restringitur. Idque evidens fit ex ultimo illo responso ex decretis Pii IX., d. 13 Aug., 1874, datis, quo expresse prohibetur, quominus in pium usum pauperis ecclesiae liceat partem majoris stipendii retinere, *nisi fiat cum consensu oblatorum.*

Atque hoc ipsum responsum clare innuit, quomodo haec stipendiorum Missae collatio consideranda sit. Nimirum habetur certa quaedam in determinatam piam causam pecuniae collatio a fidelibus facta. Verum Ecclesia semper id sibi religioni duxit, ut quam fidelissime quod in pias causas conferretur, fini destinato serviret, neque unquam permisit pro libitu pias causas mutare. Verum esset piarum causarum mutatio, si quod pro Missis datum erat, ex parte in alium finem pium impenderetur, insciis vel invitis donatoribus.

Verum eo ipso consequitur, Romanum Pontificem, qui est omnium piarum causarum supremus administrator, posse et rationabili et proportionata causa, etiam insciis donatoribus, mutationem quamdam facere atque donatorum voluntatem legitime interpretari: causae enim piae seu ecclesiasticae atque fidelium voluntates hoc sensu Summo Pontifici sunt subjectae. Attamen, ne levius fierent ejusmodi voluntates, cautum est, ne praeter S. Pontificem alii superiores hac in re quidquam agere liceret, nisi iis per Pontificem concessum sit.

Ad III^{um}. nunc jam facili negotio breviter potest responderi:

R. 1. Causa quidem pia est scilicet duplex: (1) sublevare inopiam sacerdotum indigentiorum, qui alias minore stipendio Missas celebrare deberent; (2) auxilium missionibus praestandum. Neque pro eo quod indigentioribus sacerdotibus stipendia illa parciora augeantur, excusatio haberi debet, sed pro eo solo quod Julio ex stipendiis melioribus aliquid detrahitur.

R. 2. Quum ex manualibus stipendiis agatur, excusatio Lucii si possibilis est, sumi debet vel ex voluntate Julii vel ex voluntate eorum qui majora stipendia illa dederunt. Sed quum ex casu narrato sumi debeat, horum voluntatem inquiri non posse, neque ex praesumpta voluntate hac in re agere liceat: nihil restat, nisi ut inquiratur de voluntate Julii.

R. 3. In casu dicitur quidem, Julium libentem consentire; at habemus consentientem, sicut describitur in Constit. Benedicti XIV., eo consensu, qui non sufficiat, ut liceat partem stipendii retinere: "non posse alteri stipendium minoris pretii erogari, etsi eidem sacerdoti celebranti *et consentienti* indicasset, se majoris pretii eleemosynam accepisse." Quod imprimis quidem valet, si qui alteri Missam celebrandam committit, stipendii excessum *sibi* retinet; attamen quia absolute vetatur, ne quid stipendio detrahatur, etiam pro nostro casu valere debet.

Verum quidem est, consensum longe facilius *pro libero* haberi posse, si stipendii excessus qui retinetur, in piam causam impendatur, quam si a priore sacerdote sibi retineatur; attamen sponte et ultro datus ne in nostro quidem casu est.

R. 4. Existimo igitur, ne agendi ratio Lucii jure merito scrupulis exponatur, rem ita debere agi, ut Julio ad integra stipendia 3 marc. jus conferatur, et solummodo *rogetur*, ut si sibi placeat, singulas marcas seponat pro missionum inter infideles sublevatione, atque dimidia marca augeat parciora illa stipendia quae habet et alio missurus est. In quo peragendo negotio, si Julius ita sponte consentit, Lucius dein opem ferre et auxilio esse potest.

R. 5. Quodsi Lucius timet, ne hoc modo intentum finem attingat, nihil restat, nisi ut litteris supplicibus a S. Pontifice licentiam petat, proprio Marte ita agendi: quae facultas, quum agatur de causa adeo pia non ita difficulter videtur sperari posse.

A. Lehmkuhl, S. J.

Exaeten, Holland.

TWO VIEWS REGARDING THE CONDITION AFTER DEATH OF CHILDREN WHO DIE WITHOUT THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

In the September issue of the AM. ECCL. REVIEW (p. 315), the question was proposed, "whether, according to Catholic doctrine, children who die without Baptism, suffer torment." The answer, signed H. J. H., was as follows:

The terminology of Catholic theology implies that children who die without baptism *suffer loss;* but to suffer loss is not necessarily to suffer torment or pain, unless the sufferer *realizes the loss.* Deprive an infant of its inheritance, it will play and laugh as before, because it lacks the faculty which could make it appreciate the value of the inheritance. *If the soul were to be made conscious of this loss* it would certainly cause a longing and a regret which would be equivalent to suffering; but that longing *might also be equivalent to a baptism of desire* which their previous condition prevented them from eliciting. . . . May we not assume that the longing arising from a conscious possession of capacities which their necessary condition on earth prevented them from realizing and using, will meet the mercy of Christ and bring them eventually to the fruition of His expiation in the beatific vision?

The above statement—inasmuch as it suggested the possibility of a condition of expiation after death, equivalent to a baptism of desire, and as a consequence the possibility of a transition from the state of limbo to the ultimate enjoyment of the beatific vision—brought to the editor of the REVIEW a number of communications, some in the form of inquiries, others in the shape of protests. From among the latter we select for publication the following paper by Fr. Grant; first, because it gives a complete resumé of what has been generally considered the extreme limit of a benign interpretation which Catholic orthodoxy admits; secondly, because being intended as a correction of the statement of H. J. H., it affords a fair opportunity of contrasting the arguments brought forth by the learned Abbé Didiot, from whose work Fr. Grant draws in the main his material, with the view which has been criticised.

I.

THE CONDITION OF UNBAPTIZED CHILDREN AFTER DEATH.

A query in a recent number of the REVIEW suggests this paper. The matter of it is drawn, in great part, from a recent French publication entitled *Morts sans Baptême.*[1]

The *Morts sans Baptême* is a small book in 140 pages. It consists of fourteen letters addressed to a bereaved mother who asks what the Church teaches about the condition of unbaptized children after death. In them P. Didiot gives a succinct exposé of the doctrine of the Church as expressed in Councils and pontifical documents, and from these draws such conclusions as appear warranted by Catholic theology. The merit of the book lies not in teaching the doctrine of the Church on the subject; that must be assumed as well known; but in giving official documents and in making the matter clear by theological reasons so as to convince intelligent men who inquire into it.

The doctrine of the Church is contained in the following proposition, which at the same time offers a convenient distribution of the matter into three paragraphs.

CHILDREN WHO DIE WITHOUT BAPTISM DO NOT ENTER THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, NOR ARE THEY CONDEMNED TO HELL; THEY ENJOY NATURAL HAPPINESS *for all time in limbo.*

I.

It is the doctrine of the Church that children who die unbaptized never enter the kingdom of heaven. She has given expression to this teaching as often as she has dealt with the

1 By Canon Didiot, late dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University of Lille, and presently professor of Moral in the same institution. Readers of the *Revue des Sciences Ecclesiastiques* printed formerly at Amiens, now at Lille, will appreciate his authority; indeed the book notices of European theological reviews on the several volumes that have appeared of his *Cours de Theologie Catholique* recognize in him not only a master theologian, but, what is not always the case in men of great erudition, a metaphysician of singular clearness and method.

necessity or efficacy of Baptism. Against the Pelagians, whose opinions lead them to deny the efficacy and necessity of this Sacrament, the Church maintained the necessity of it in order that the newly born infant be purified from the stain which kept it out of heaven. The Second Council of Mileve, held in 416, and approved by Innocent I., also the Council of Carthage, held in 418, and approved by Pope Zozimus, deal with the question. The conclusion of the second canon of either Council is as follows: "Propter hanc enim regulam fidei etiam parvuli, qui nihil peccatorum in semetipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur ut in eis regeneratione mundetur quod generatione traxerunt."[1] There is a second part of this canon, the authenticity of which is dubious, but which nevertheless explains the reason of the foregoing doctrine. It is worded thus: "Item placuit ut si quis dicit, ideo dixisse Dominum: 'In domo Patris mei mansiones multae sunt,' ut intelligatur, quia in regno coelorum erit aliquis medius aut ullus alicubi locus ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui sine baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt, sine quo in regnum coelorum, quod est vita aeterna, intrare non possunt, anathema sit. Nam, cum Dominus dicat: 'Nisi qūis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non intrabit in regnum coelorum;' quis catholicus dubitet participem fieri diaboli eum qui cohaeres esse non meruit Christi? Qui enim dextra caret, sinistram procul dubio partem incurret."

Again the Waldenses, in 1200, dispute the necessity of Baptism. In a reply to the Archbishop of Arles, which certainly now carries with it dogmatic authority, for it is inserted in the official codes,[2] Pope Innocent III. declares that the penalty of original sin is "carentia visionis Dei." In 1267 Clement IV. presented a Profession of Faith to the Greek Emperor Michael Paleologus, which Gregory X. accepted from him in the Second Council of Lyons. Relative to the condition of unbaptized children after death, this

1 Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, No. 60.

2 *Decret.* I., iii., tit. xlii., C. iii. Majores.

Profession of Faith declares that "illorum autem animas qui in mortali peccato vel cum solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas."[1] These declarations, repeated as they are in subsequent Councils and Professions of Faith, together with the doctrine of the Church on original sin, and the collation of sanctifying grace through Baptism and Penance, are sufficient to make it clear that, according to Catholic teaching, unbaptized children after death not only are not in heaven, but never will be admitted there. The teaching which the Church received from Christ leaves no doubt on the subject: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven;" nor is there anything in revelation to authorize the belief that the penalty of original sin will be mitigated or abolished, and that finally unbaptized children will enter heaven. The penalty of original sin is "participem fieri diaboli," "carere visionis Dei," "descendere in infernum," not for a time but absolutely. Were it for a time, the Church, who knows what is revealed, would know it and would have stated it; but as there is no restriction to that effect, we are not warranted in asserting it. Some theologians have ventured to suggest that the prayers of parents or the ministry of angels might secure sanctifying grace and thereby avert the calamity. But the data of revelation forbid the pious reverie. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." A canon, too, in the Council of Trent emphasizes the belief of the Church not only that children require Baptism in order to reach heaven, but, moreover, that only by Baptism can they obtain sanctifying grace which is the means to it.[2]

But why is sanctifying grace so necessary to heaven, and why is it conferred on children only through Baptism?

1 Denzinger, ib., 387.

2 Justificatio est "translatio ab eo statu in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adae, in statum gratiae . . . quae quidem translatio post evangelium promulgatum sine lavacro regenerationis, aut ejus voto, fieri non potest." Conc. Trid. Sess. VI., cap. 4.

When men have learned the fact of revelation they are apt to ask such questions, for they wish to know, not only the fact, but as far as possible the reason thereof. To reply, one must needs go back to the question of the beatific vision. As it is the goal whither religion tends, it is by it that religion must be explained. God, then, created us, that we might be happy with Him forever. He wishes us to share His happiness and thereby to be happy ourselves. But with our finite faculties we cannot know and love as God does, nor can we share completely in His happiness, because what gives happiness to Him is beyond the capacity of our mental vision. Wherefore, as God wishes us to share His happiness, He must and does give us supernatural assistance of grace in this world and glory in the next, to do so. In virtue of it, and as far as our finite faculties allow, for we can never comprehend the infinite, we are enabled to know and love as does God. Consequently the Divine Essence becomes the object of our faculties as it is of His and it causes our happiness as it does His. But if this participation of divine power be refused, it follows that man can neither see nor love the Divine Essence directly, nor share in the same happiness that God experiences in the contemplation and possession of it. As a matter of fact, grace was withdrawn from the human race on account of the rebellion of our first parents ; nor after the atonement made by our Redeemer is it restored to men as a race, but only to such individuals as repudiate the allegiance of their race to the devil and declare their personal adherence to God. That is done in Baptism, be it of water, of desire, or of blood. It is therefore through Baptism alone that grace is restored. Nor can we suppose God unjust to the helpless little ones who are neglected or cannot be assisted by adults in charge of them. The beatific vision is not due to us nor, if we do not enjoy it, are we deprived of anything that God should give to us by reason of creation. If they do not receive that wholly gratuitous gift, it is because of the misconduct and consequent miseries, physical and moral, of the race to which they belong.

II.

Although excluded from heaven, unbaptized children are not condemned to hell. The penalty of original sin is negative; it consists in the withdrawal of a privilege to which we are not entitled. By reason of the supernatural destiny which God proposed to man, our first parents were born in the state of original justice, which were means to attain it. But they sinned; and lost for themselves and for their race the means to share the happiness of God. The effect of that is, not that unbaptized children after death are condemned to hell, but that they do not share the happiness of God, simply because they had not the means to do so. This teaching of Catholic theology is voiced by St. Thomas. He says the only penalty of original sin is the "privatio illius finis ad quem donum subtractum ordinabat, ad quod per se natura humana attingere non potest. Hoc autem est divina visio: et ideo carentia hujus visionis est propria et sola poena originalis peccati post mortem."[1] Moreover the justice of God will not tolerate the idea that innocent children be punished in hell eternally for a condition of things they were in no wise instrumental in bringing about. As hell is the unhappy condition of those who received means to go to God and abused them, or might have had means but refused them, it cannot be that those to whom means were never offered and who never were aware of their existence, be nevertheless found equally guilty as the others and punished accordingly. This is brought home to us all the more clearly if we recall that according to the Fathers, the most fatal punishment of hell is precisely exclusion from heaven. "A tantis excidisse bonis," says St. John Chrysostom, "tantum inferit doloris, afflictionis, angustiae, ut etiamsi nullum aliud esset supplicium peccatoribus destinatum, illud solum posset graviorem aliis gehennae cruciatibus inferre poenam animaeque perturbationem; . . . nec opinor adeo lugendum esse de gehennae malis ut de amisso coelorum regno: hic enim est cruciatus

1 *Summa Theologica*, III. Partis Supplementum; appendix, quaestio iii., Art. 1.

omnium acerbissimus."[1] And St. Augustine, who was nevertheless disposed to find for unbaptized children after death a "mitissima damnatio" in hell, says of it: "perire a regno Dei, exulare a civitate Dei, carere tam magna multitudine dulcedinis Dei, quam abscondit timentibus se, quam grandis est poena ut nulla ei possint tormenta, quae novimus, comparari."[2] With such declarations before us, it is difficult to imagine how those who hold that God deals harshly with children that die unbaptized, escape the dilemma: either God is unjust or the little souls are not in hell.

The same official documents that convey the teaching of the Church that unbaptized children after death are not in heaven, tell us they are not condemned to hell.

The declaration of Innocent III. says that "poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis Dei." The word "carentia" is very significant: the Pope does not say "privatio" which would indicate the negation of something due, the denial of which would be painful, but "carentia"—the refusal on the part of God to accord a premium, gratuitously, if at all, awarded; the withholding of which, moreover, occasions no distress because grace given to obtain it, is the means by which it is known. This is all the more evident from the text in question: "poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis Dei . . . actualis vero peccati est gehennae perpetuae cruciatus." The penalty of actual (mortal) sin is the endless torment of hell, but the penalty of original sin is denial of the inheritance of heaven. In neither case do the souls see God; but those excluded because of mortal sin are conscious of their loss and in consequence suffer the pain of damnation, while souls prevented through original sin from entering heaven are in blissful ignorance of what might have been.

Although it causes no pain, exclusion from heaven is a penalty and the Church has ever considered it as such. Indeed it is an incalculable calamity for a soul to lose heaven

1 *Ad Theodorum lapsum Epist.* L., No. 10, 12. 2 *Enchiridion*, cap. 93.
2 *Enchiridion*, cap. 112—cited by Jungmann, *De Novissimis*, 27.

wherein, because invested with divine power, it could see God face to face, as He is, and sharing thereby in divine happiness, be itself supremely happy forever, while on the contrary, in limbo the happiness that souls attain by reaching the truth and goodness of God mediately through created things, though complete in its natural order because satisfying natural capacity for it, is so infinitely distant from the happiness of God as to be inadmissible for comparison with it. Moreover as it is due to the devil that souls are not born in the state of grace so also is it due to him that they are excluded from heaven. Hence it is true to say that to a certain extent even the souls of unbaptized children in limbo are affected by his power and are so far associated with him that they, as he, are not in the presence of God. It must be remarked, too, that ecclesiastical language denominates as "inferni" or the lower regions, whatever places there may be outside of the one in which alone is manifested the glory of God. Such are the *limbus patrum* or Abraham's bosom whither Christ descended after the Crucifixion, the *limbus puerorum*, and the hell of the lost. These facts find expression in the official documents already cited and because not properly understood, have sometimes appeared harsh and confusing. That part of the canon of the Councils of Mileve and Carthage in particular, which is of dubious authenticity, asks: "Quis catholicus dubitet participem fieri diaboli eum qui cohaeres esse non meruit Christi? Qui enim dextra caret, sinistram procul dubio partem incurret." These words when compared with the foregoing condemnation of the Pelagians who taught that children after death, even though unbaptized enjoy the beatific vision, are clear and logical; nor are we in anywise warranted in suspecting that the bishops of the Council which did enact them were affected by the same severity that appears in some African Fathers.[1] The canon speaks not of torments, nor flames, nor suffering. It says merely the souls of unbaptized children are

1 St. Fulgentius, *De Fide ad Patrum* and *De Veritate Praedestinationis;* also St. Augustine, Serm. xiv., *De Verbis Apostoli*, c. iii.; *De Peccatorum Remissione; De Nuptiis et Concup. ad Val.*

associated with the devil on the left, since they cannot be associated with the Redeemer on the right. Likewise the decree of the Second Council of Lyons, confirmed in the Council of Florence and inserted in subsequent Professions, declares that "illorum animas qui in mortali peccato vel cum solo originali decedunt mox *in infernum descendere poenis* tamen disparibus *puniendas*." The souls descend into the lower regions wherein, outside of heaven, are the abodes of the different categories of intelligent immortal beings that do not enter heaven. Of the souls even of unbaptized children is the word "puniendas" used in the same sense and for the same reason that Innocent III. decreed there was a "poena" —a penalty (not a punishment) for original sin. The "poenis tamen disparibus puniendas" is a declaration that after death, unbaptized children are not in hell. They and those guilty of mortal sin undergo different penalties. Were both condemned to hell the penalties would be *impar*, unequal, not *dispar*, different. In what the disparity consists we know from the aforenoted declaration made against the Waldenses by Innocent III.

A later official act from the See of Peter not only maintained the Catholic belief that the souls of unbaptized children after death are not in hell, but at the same time made a positive profession of our belief in the existence of such a place as Limbo. It is the constitution "Auctorem fidei," by Pius VI., against the Jansenists in 1794. Assembled in council at Pistoja the Jansenists treated as a "fable of the Pelagians" the existence of "locum illum inferorum (quem limbi puerorum nomine fideles passim designant) in quo animae decedentium cum sola originali culpa poena damni citra poenam ignis puniantur." These sectarians held that such an opinion renewed the myth about "locum illum et statum medium expertem culpae et poenae inter regnum Dei et damnationem aeternam, qualem fabulabantur Pelagiani."[1] Pius VI. condemned the proposition as false, rash, and offensive to Catholic ears.

1 Denzinger, 1389.

But it is not only by word and verbal profession that the Church confesses her doctrine; her conduct is an expression of her faith. Hence there is in the Church no less unequivocal profession of faith with regard to the after-death condition of unbaptized children than her conduct in procuring the baptism of children in general. Both the Roman Ritual and Canon Law contain official regulations thereupon. While the Ritual[1] recalls the "universal necessity of this Sacrament for salvation" and also the "sovereign diligence with which it should be administered," it provokes no indiscretion nor approves any exaggeration in the baptizing of children. Canon law, too, upholds an immemorial prohibition to baptize children of Jewish parentage so long as they had not come to the use of reason and were in parental custody. Moreover, the morality of this conduct is taught in schools of theology[2] and laws to this effect have been promulgated officially by the popes.[3] This categorical refusal of the Church to baptize children, whose baptism she certainly might have encouraged, but who, were they baptized, would have been exposed to inevitable heresy did they come to the use of reason, dominates the entire question, and shows better than anything else, the belief of the Church that unbaptized children after death are not condemned to hell.

III.

Unbaptized children after death enjoy natural happiness in limbo forever. The foregoing pontifical documents to hand, no Catholic can question the existence of limbo. We know, too, that God will not annihilate souls He created immortal. Children then who die without baptism are in limbo forever. They enjoy natural happiness there. St. Thomas explains[4] that happiness in man is due to the attainment of an ultimate

1 Titulum ii., cap. i., Nos. 15–21.

2 St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, iii., 68, 10.

3 Benedict XIV. Letter *Postremo Mense*, 1747.

4 *Summa*, I.II., Q. iii., art. 2 and 6.

perfection secured through the intelligence and will when these faculties act upon their respective objects. As these are the "true" and the "good" and as God is the source of all truth and all goodness, it follows that there can be no happiness without union with Him. Union with God is two-fold: mediate, as on this earth, where we see Him through created things and from them learn imperfectly the truth and goodness of the Creator, represented in them: and immediate, in heaven where, in a glorified state, we shall see Him as He is. When union with God takes place through the unaided power of the intelligence and will in the possession of creatures wherein He is knowable and known, the happiness that ensues is natural. It is this union that exists between God and the souls in limbo.

They, in the first place, are not cut off from God and in consequence suffer none of that pain which such separation entails. They do not suffer the pain of the lost, because they are not lost, and not in hell. They do not suffer the pain of purgatory because having committed no sin, they have no atonement to make. Eternal separation from God causes intense pain to the souls in hell because there is entailed by it not only the negation of everything except life, but also suffering and horrid association in exterior darkness. Likewise, the soul detained for a time in purgatory is conscious of exclusion from God due to the humiliating effect of sin which made it unfit to enter heaven. But in the child that dies without baptism there is nothing that is repulsive to God or that causes detestation of Him, nor on the other hand is there anything that makes it fear the devil or which gives him power over it. The little one therefore, pure, good, beautiful by nature, because made to the image and likeness of God, nor sullied by sin, is not cast out into external darkness. True, it does not see God in the light of glory, nor even in the light of grace, but it does see Him in the light of reason. Its intelligence and will can and do attain that ultimate perfection which comes from the knowledge and love of God, and albeit it be imperfect and "in speculo," yet knowing the reality of no greater, the soul in limbo can desiderate no hap-

piness other than its own. There will be nothing to interrupt its happiness, for pain and death are done; nothing will disturb it, for vice, such as envy, jealousy, ambition can find no place where diabolic disorder is inadmissible. Nor will the happiness of children in limbo be circumscribed by other limits than those of the human soul to know and love God by the power that is natural to it. The children therefore will know and love God and their associates because of Him. They will be lovable to Him and them and to themselves and hence will be happy forever.

Assuredly, the thesis is open to some perplexing difficulties. Canon Didiot proposes some of them; two in particular must suggest themselves to all who look into the question. Will not the children in limbo perceive that they are separated from other members of their race who are not damned? Will they not remark, at the time of the resurrection, that the bodies of the just rise glorified, while their own are deprived of that perfection? If such be the case, will not that knowledge betray the nature of the supernatural happiness they are deprived of, and thereby expose them to the pain that exclusion from heaven causes to the lost? Canon Didiot replies in the affirmative. He is even disposed to believe that between the beatified in heaven and the souls in limbo there will be a certain amount of intercourse,[1] but he denies the consequence apprehended in the question. They will perceive the separation between themselves and others who are "intra ordinem;" but content with their own state and utterly ignorant of that of the blessed, it is impossible to imagine unhappiness among them. Granting intercourse between heaven and limbo, the children will, nevertheless, learn nothing of the beatific vision, because the blessed will make no revelation which God has been pleased to withhold. And if they perceive in the bodies of the beatified a splendor which is not their own, we cannot infer that they suffer because of it. The hierarchical gradation in the angelic choirs, for instance, is not a source of pain; on the contrary,

1 Lettre vii.

the greater angels are a joy to the others as a more perfect means than their own intelligence and will to the knowledge and love of God.[1] May it not be so among men? As what is lovable in creatures is the participation of the truth and goodness of the Divine Model, it follows that the more perfect are the more lovable and the cause of greater joy as being a better representation of Him whom the human intelligence, even aided by the light of glory, can never comprehend. Moreover, the submission of all to God will be perfect; he who disturbed it on earth can do so no longer. Each, therefore, will be content in his individual happiness, and all will glorify God in His outward manifestations in others.

The children of limbo, therefore, are happy, and will be so forever. For them the "carentia visionis Dei," although objective and real, is not subjective. It is not a personal, individual penalty which they are aware of.

On the contrary, it is a penalty inflicted on the race, the members of which are deprived of power to share in the happiness of God. In consequence thereof, individuals, as these who do not recover the assistance of grace through Baptism, never attain the destiny proposed to men by God when, at the solicitation of His divine goodness, which willed the happiness of creatures, He created them for that beatitude He understood to be possible if they were created to His own image and likeness and empowered by grace to enjoy like happiness as Himself.

JAMES A. GRANT.

San Francisco, Cal.

ANOTHER VIEW.

The reader of the foregoing paper may have noticed two things in the argument of the Abbé Didiot as given by Father Grant: a want of logic in drawing his main conclusion, and a misapprehension of fact in admitting an analogy between the condition of the inhabitants of limbo and that of the angelic choirs.

1 St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I., qu. lvi., ad 4.

Having cited the declarations of Councils and Pontiffs to the effect that original sin *entails a penalty*, the writer concludes that this penalty is necessarily and in all cases *eternal.*[1]

There is not a single word in the Councils or Pontifical declarations to force this conclusion. Had the author laid stress on the argument of St. Thomas (Comm. in Sent. Lombardi, iv. dist. 45, qu. ii., a. 2), that the cessation of the earthly life limits the acquisition of grace, he might have arrived at such a conclusion. But St. Thomas, deeply as we must reverence his judgment, was neither Council nor infallible Pontiff.

Further, admitting that the children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism may become conscious of their loss,[2] the Abbé Didiot believes that such consciousness need not be a source of pain to them, since "*the hierarchical gradation in the angelic choirs is not a source of pain*" to the angels. No. The angels are not conscious of any *loss;* they may be conscious of a *difference;* but as they enjoy the complete happiness which corresponds to the full capacity of their created nature, they can have no unfulfilled desire. The souls of the innocents, on the other hand, who die without the Sacrament of Baptism, are deprived of that essential enjoyment which was to fill their created capacity and engage all their faculties, for it is known that every human being, when the moment arrives at which

1 "The foregoing pontifical documents to hand," he says, "no Catholic can question the existence of limbo. We know, too, that God will not annihilate souls He created immortal. Children then who die without baptism are in limbo *forever.*" And again: "These declarations are sufficient to make it clear that . . . . unbaptized children after death not only are not in heaven, but *never will be admitted there.*" (Italics ours.) Let any one honestly try to draw such conclusions from the premises given; he cannot do so unless he has first added his preconceived notion to them.

2 "Will not that knowledge betray the nature of the supernatural happiness they are deprived of, and thereby expose them to the pain that exclusion from heaven causes to the lost? Didiot replies in the affirmative;" although immediately afterwards he appears to deny the conclusion without answering it except by the above-quoted analogy.

these faculties are matured, experiences an undefinable longing for happiness ; and this is true both of those who are baptized and those who are not. Every man may voluntarily exchange the good which corresponds to this longing, eternal hatred for eternal love, but, whether perverted in hell or blessed in heaven, the soul continues to exercise its faculties in an infinite measure satisfying the justice of God ; and we believe this precisely because we do not assume that God annihilates His creatures. To some theologians the condition of the unbaptized in limbo if it be eternal, has appeared to indicate a creation inadequate to its original purpose. To escape this difficulty they have conceived that these children will at the end of the present dispensation repeople a newly created paradise, like that of Eden, so as to fulfil the design of God which has given them a capacity for perfect enjoyment according to their nature ; and that thus all creatures will be made to return to the harmony of His first and great creative purpose, some satisfying His love and mercy, many others His justice.

The pointing out of these inconsistencies in what have become trite arguments seems to me necessary, to warn the reader not to carry into this inquiry any preconceived bias, for it is a subject the right appreciation of which is of great practical utility in this skeptical age, when polemics must take on a somewhat new temper if they would secure the sympathy that brings conviction.

And now let me state my own point of view. I am not defending any particular theory as to the condition after death of children who pass into eternity without having received the Sacrament of Baptism. God knows. He is just and He is above all merciful, and that is enough for us. He has commanded baptism as a means of removing the weakness brought upon our race by the fall of our first parents, and we have to exercise all care to comply with the command at the risk of eternal salvation.

What I remonstrate against, in faith and reason, is the exclusiveness which denies, as though it were un-Catholic to hold, that God may supply in some cases by penance to

be endured hereafter, the grace which removes the guilt of original sin; and that it would be wrong to soothe a parent's grief with the reflection that her child, having died by an inexorable necessity without baptism of water, *may* some day be united with her in heaven. In other words, I contend that a Catholic may hold (not only *salva fide orthodoxa*, but in perfect analogy with Catholic dogma and the *pietas fidei* which calls for assent to teachings not specifically defined) the possibility of a condition of expiation after death, (which has its incipient cause in some act or condition of this life), equivalent to the *baptismus flaminis* or baptism of desire, which the theologians speak of and which the Church admits.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH AND THE TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH.

The *consensus* of theologians on any one point of doctrine constitutes an accepted standard for its interpretation, and to deviate from that *consensus* is un-Catholic.

Nevertheless there are periods of comparative rigor in the manner in which certain aspects of doctrine have been emphasized by the great theologians. If we attentively study the history of these periods we shall understand the reason of this. It is the same policy as that which manifests itself in God's dealings with the people of the Synagogue when compared to the Church of Christ; it is the same policy which accounts for St. Paul's varying treatment of the nations whom he evangelized; it is the policy which explains the severity of the early codes of penance, or of the Inquisition so far as it was an instrument of discipline in the Church, when compared to the indulgence which she grants her delinquent children to-day.

Looking over the history of theological opinions touching the condition of children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism or its equivalents (martyrdom and desire), we find a great difference which is not wholly eliminated, even if we allow for the altered force of the terminology employed by authoritative writers on the subject.

The teaching of the Church is based on, and comprised in the words of our Lord (John iii., 5), "Unless a man be *born again of water* and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and again (Mark, xvi., 16), "He that believeth and is *baptized*, shall be saved."

The necessity of baptism by water is clearly expressed. The belief that the Apostles were obliged to descend to the lower world to baptize the souls detained in limbo is one of the first interpretations we meet with in the early Church (*Similit. Past. Hermae*, ix., cap. 16.—Clem. Alex. Strom. vi., 45, p. 763, etc.). Tertullian, St. Irenaeus, St. Augustine, are equally uncompromising. The latter not only maintained, if we accept his words literally, that unbaptized children, in general, were subject to eternal pain (quamvis mitissima), but that we should not as Catholics believe or teach the possibility of anyone being saved who did not receive actually this Sacrament. (Noli credere nec docere, aliquos eorum qui sine baptismo Christi ex hac vita emigraverunt . . ad regni coelorum beatitudinem pervenire, si vis esse catholicus. *Enchir.*, 42, Or. an. 3, 12.) I believe that St. Augustine's doctrine need not present any great difficulty to the theologian. He used strong words because he was striving to confute the Pelagian heresy which maintained a limbo of happiness and thus minimized the necessity of baptism. Occasionally we find him accept a milder view (*De bapt.*, iv., 22); and then again retract it for fear of opening the way to misapprehension and laxity in practice (*Retract.* ii., 18). Subsequently we find milder advocates, at least in expression. The Greek Fathers generally and the later Latin writers, consider as subject to eternal suffering only those who *wilfully refuse* to avail themselves of the grace of salvation through baptism. They explain at length that there are ways in which salvation conditioned upon the reception of baptism by water, may be supplied, as by the *votum sacramenti*, the *baptismus flaminis* (desiderii, poenitentiae) and the *baptismus sanguinis*. But none of these substitutes imprint upon the soul the sacramental *character* of baptism by water. The scholastics, after William of

Auxerre and Alexander of Hales, teach that this character imparts a special title and a particular aptitude to the soul; and so far it implies *a special grace not received by those who are saved by the baptism of desire or that of martyrdom.* The baptism of desire derives its saving effect *ex opere operantis;* the baptism of blood on the contrary *ex opere operato*, or as some say *quasi ex opere operato.* This is important. Let us see how the baptism of blood saves the child that dies without the baptism of water, and how it effects the removal of original sin and thus the transmission of justice and supernatural life.

According to St. Thomas (iii. p., q. 66, a. 12, ad 2), martyrdom is an equivalent of baptism by a certain privilege, "ratione imitationis mortis Christi," but it requires charity as a concomitant. "*Sanguinis effusionem non habere rationem baptismi si sit sine caritate;* caritas enim obtinetur; sed ad eam obtinendam sufficit dispositio sita in attritione, existente martyrio, quemadmodum existente sacramento." (Cf. Ballerini, iv., p. 520.) A person who is capable of eliciting this act of charity is saved by the baptism of martyrdom, inasmuch as he suffers death for the love of Christ; not otherwise, according to the Angelic Doctor, for to die is not enough. But a child is not capable of eliciting this act of charity or of forming any intention. It suffers martyrdom as it suffers death, unconscious of the cause, and without any alternative as to a free choice of life on its own part. There is really no difference between a child dying by the persecutor's hand and a child dying from other violent or natural cause, so far as its own disposition and personal merit are concerned. It is in no wise like the baptism of desire or, what is the same, of blood, in the martyr who is making a conscious profession of his faith in Christ; and this faith he seals by voluntary death. Hence, according to the reasons assigned by theologians, martyrdom cannot have the effect of baptism upon children before they are conscious of the sacrifice to be made for Christ.

Nevertheless, the Church celebrates the feast of the Holy Innocents, and thereby sanctions the contention that mar-

tyrdom in the case of infants incapable of eliciting any act of the will, may remove the obstacle which would otherwise prevent their attaining the beatific vision. Alexander of Hales finds it impossible to explain the difficulty suggested by this fact except on the ground that these children had obtained the sacramental of circumcision. St. Leo (Serm. xxx. and xxxi.) declares it to have been a special miracle the motive of which lies in Christ's love for children: "Let the little ones come unto Me, and do not forbid them the kindom of heaven." Surely this would apply alike to all children. The scholastics, with but few exceptions, admit that martyrdom supplies baptism in the case of children. (Suarez, D. 29, S. 1.) Yet they do not assign any adequate reason.

The baptism of blood, like that of desire, although it remits guilt, does not always remit the entire penalty, so that sufferings in the next world may have to atone for some defect clinging to the soul in its departure from this life. St. Bonaventure, Durandus, Gabriel, Gerson, Cajetan, and others, allow that the desire or prayer of a parent for the salvation of the child, who, without its own or its parents' fault, dies deprived of the Sacrament of Baptism, may effect the baptismal grace which removes original sin and procures for the child entrance into heaven. Such a vicarious desire would accordingly, like the baptism of blood in those who die with attrition, remit the guilt of sin; but it may, according to the degree of its intensity, fail to remit the entire penalty due to sin. May not the child then have to undergo some process of satisfying the justice of God, and after that attain the beatific vision in the same manner in which it is effected by the baptism of blood? And would not this explain the words of St. John concerning our Lord: "He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and *fire*" (Matt., iii, 11.), which have puzzled the exegetes of all ages up to our own time, and which Origen, St. Jerome and others interpret as referring to the expiatory flames of the next world?

This is in reality what the famous Proposition 85 of Pius VI. implies when it condemns the Pelagian error of *a third*

eternal abode between heaven and hell where there is neither guilt nor punishment. "The doctrine which does away with (explodit) the limbo where unbaptized children suffer the pain of loss (citra poenam ignis)—as though that were a place and state devoid of guilt and punishment (expertem culpae et poenae), midway between heaven and hell, such as the Pelagians imagined, is contrary to the Catholic teaching." It is true that St. Thomas argues in behalf of a state of contentment on the part of those who realize that they have no right to the happiness of the beatific vision. But what has lost them this right purchased for them by our Lord's Sacrifice? In many cases it is an accident in which malice of neither parent nor child has part, and which under all aspects would produce a regret in those on whom the loss falls. This is indeed what Bellarmin, whom others follow in view of the previous statement of St. Thomas, has explicitly termed it—"interior animi *dolor*, quamvis mitissimus" (De am. gr., vi., 1-6).

It has been generally admitted that, whatever the condition after death of children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism, their natural faculties will attain that development and ripeness which would satisfy at least the *natural* desire for happiness. Now there are good reasons for assuming that this development grows upon the soul with the gradual weakening or removal of the corporal bonds which hold it captive. Evidences of this are found not merely in the peculiar illumination of mind which we read of as having accompanied the last hours of saints like St. Bernard, who, in a foretaste of the beatific vision interprets the prophetic and mystic meaning of the Canticle of Canticles, but also in the ordinary sick in whom delirium frequently ceases and consciousness sets in shortly before dissolution; even with the insane it has been observed that they obtain some lucid spell at the hour of death when they need the realization of sorrow and the Sacraments; nay it is well known that a sudden danger overtaking a person in the midst of health often spreads before him a wondrous panorama of the past and future, so that he may in an

instant realize the guilt of years, and disavow by the light of that awful flash the wrong that was previously hidden from his own thoughtless or blinded self. Who will say that a child cannot or may not receive, by some grace of intercession, such a light at the moment of death? St. John is very definite in his assertion that Christ "*enlighteneth every human creature coming into this world.*" He makes no exception; and he had probably a closer insight into the merciful Heart of our Lord than any theologian since his time. Modern writers cite Gregory of Nyssa, Scotus and Cajetan in support of the opinion that a baptism of desire may thus at the moment of death prepare the soul for the beatific vision. (Vd. Schanz, *Sacramentenlehre*, ed. 1893, pag. 277.) This possibility does not exclude the penalty such as corresponds to the *poena damni* of limbo, only that such a penalty would have the nature of a purifying process instead of being eternal.

There is another thought to which some theologians have attached much weight, although I do not wish to exaggerate its importance. It is this, that the soul does not leave the body by a sudden act, but that there ensues a condition of suspense after all the bodily faculties have ceased to act. Possibly the Offertory in the liturgy of the dead may here both afford and find an explanation, for it certainly suggests the extension of the period for attaining certain graces which we consider limited to what seems to us the term of earthly life. "Libera eas de ore leonis *ne absorbeat eas tartarus*, ne cadant *in obscurum*." (Offert. Miss. de Requie.) The days which intervene between the *dies obitus* and the *dies depositionis* seem to hold mysterious power to sway the final destiny.

No doubt some one will here appeal to St. Thomas (IV. Dist. 45, q. ii., a. 2) who says that the suffrages of the living cannot be of use to the children in limbo. This is unquestionably true when their fate has been fixed by the judgment of God. But the question is whether the lot of children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism or without the baptism of blood, may not attain some grace to escape eternal banish-

ment from the beatific vision. St. Thomas admits that original sin may be atoned for in a vicarious way; who then can say that the prayers and sacrifices of parents and of others in behalf of souls who "sit in the shadow of death," will not procure for many of these children the hope of the beatific vision, for which God created them, which He wishes them to attain, and for the attainment of which every soul is promised sufficient grace through the Redemption?

I do not care to appear to controvert an established opinion of the Angelic Doctor, but in view of what he says concerning suffrages for the children who die without baptism I would recall the well-known incident related in the *Acta martyrum* regarding St. Perpetua. When in prison, an admonition came to her in a dream that she should pray for her little brother Dinocrates who had died at the age of seven. She did so. That same night she saw him longingly stretching out his hands toward a pond of water which was above him so that he was unable to reach it. Awaking she found herself in tears. Convinced that her brother was suffering, she prayed for him night and day, until in another dream she saw him again, pouring out limpid water with which he refreshed himself and then joyously moved about like a happy child at play. When she awoke she felt that he had been delivered from pain—"translatum esse de poena."

St. Augustine, who refers to these acts and credits the vision of St. Perpetua, believes that Dinocrates had been baptized. And yet the fact that St. Perpetua herself was not baptized at the time when she was cast into prison, makes it unlikely that her younger brother received the Sacrament. Of course there are possible explanations, and when St. Thomas says that we cannot help those in limbo, he means those who have not received the Sacrament of Baptism *or some substitute* which would remove the guilt of original sin. And the question upon which the discussion turns here is not whether there is a place which perpetually shuts out souls from the beatific vision to which they have forfeited their right. To question that would be as un-

reasonable as to question the justice of degrees in eternal reward or punishment.

What I have attempted to maintain is not, therefore, the non-existence of a place where the unbaptized are denied the beatific vision without otherwise suffering the pain of sense, but that the Church does nowhere teach that children who die without the *Sacrament of Baptism*, or without martyrdom, are absolutely prevented from receiving a subsequent grace which by making them conscious of their loss allows them to atone for the guilt implied in original sin, and thus may enable them to attain the beatific vision. Or, to put it more practically—that none has a right to state to a parent that his child will be eternally separated from him in the next life, and denied the beatific vision, because that child did not receive the actual baptism of water or of blood.

To hope for the salvation of a child, through the mercy of God which supplies the ways of baptism by desire, leaves wholly intact the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation. If a parent neglects from any cause whatever, to have his child baptized, he and the child are participants of the loss. But where baptism of water is a *physical impossibility*, a fore-denied conclusion, there we trust the mercy of God to make salvation possible in some other way devised by His omnipotence, and the possibility of a limbo where desire develops into conscious love is all we maintain, as not only consistent with Catholic doctrine but dictated by Catholic charity.

H. J. H.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII.

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA
DE UNITATE ORDINIS FRATRUM MINORUM INSTAURANDA.

LEO EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.

Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.

Felicitate quadam nec sane fortuito factum putamus, ut Nobis olim, in episcopatu gerendo, ex omnibus Italiae provinciis una Francisci Assisiensis parens atque altrix Umbria contingeret. Assuevimus enim acrius et attentius de patre seraphico locorum admonitu cogitare; cumque indicia eius permulta, ac velut impressa vestigia passim intueremur, quae non memoriam eius solum Nobis afferebant, sed ipsum videbantur in conspectu Nostro ponere: cum Alverniae iuga semel atque iterum ascensu superavimus: cum ob oculos ea loca versarentur, ubi editus ac

susceptus in lucem, ubi corporis exsolutus vinclis, unde ipso auctore tanta vis bonorum, tanta salus in omnes orientis atque obeuntis solis partes influxit, licuit profecto plenius ac melius cognoscere quanto viro quantum munus assignatum a Deo. Mire cepit Nos franciscana species atque forma : quoniamque intimam franciscalium institutorum virtutem magnopere ad christianam vitae rationem videbamus conduxisse, neque eam esse huiusmodi ut consenescere vetustate possit, propterea in ipso episcopatu Perusino, ad christianam pietatem augendam tuendosque in multitudine mores probos Ordinem Tertium, quem Nosmetipsi viginti quinque iam annos profitemur, dedita opera restituere ac propagare studuimus. Eumdem animum in hoc apostolici muneris fastigium eamdemque voluntatem ex eo tempore susceptam attulimus. Ob eamque caussam cum non circumscripte, sed ubique gentium eum ipsum Ordinem florere in spem beneficiorum veterum cuperemus, praescripta legum quibus regeretur, quatenus opus esse visum est, temperavimus, ut quemvis e populo christiano invitaret atque alliceret effecta mollior et accommodatior temporibus disciplina. Expectationem desiderii ac spei Nostrae sat implevit exitus.

Verumtamen Noster erga magnum Franciscum et erga res ab eo institutas singularis amor omnino quiddam adhuc postulabat : idque efficere Deo aspirante decrevimus. Animum videlicet studiumque Nostrum nunc convertit ad sese franciscanus Ordo princeps : nec sane facile reperiatur in quo evigilare enixius atque amantius curas cogitationesque Nostras oporteat. Insignis est enim et benevolentia studioque Sedis Apostolicae dignissima ea, quae Fratrum Minorum familia nominatur, beati Francisci frequens ac mansura soboles. Ei quidem parens suus, quas leges, quae praecepta vivendi ipse dedisset, ea omnia imperavit ut religiosissime custodiret in perpetuitate consequentium temporum : nec frustra imperavit. Vix enim societas hominum est ulla, quae tot virtuti rigidos custodes eduxerit, vel tot nomini christiano praecones, Christo martyres, caelo cives ediderit : aut in qua tantus virorum proventus, qui iis artibus, quibus qui excellunt praestare ceteris iudicantur, rem christianam remque ipsam civilem illustrarint, adiuverint.

Horum quidem bonorum non est dubitandum maiorem et constantiorem futuram ubertatem fuisse, si arctissimum coniunctionis concordiaeque vinculum, quale in prima Ordinis aetate

viguit, perpetuo mansisset: quia *virtus quanto est magis unita, tanto est fortior, et per separationem minuitur.*[1] Quod optime viderat et caverat mens provida Francisci, quippe qui suorum societatem praeclare finxit fundavitque ut corpus unum non solubili compage aptum et connexum. Quid revera voluit, quid egit aliud cum unicam proposuit vivendi regulam, quam omnes sine ulla nec temporum nec locorum exceptione servarent, vel cum unius rectoris maximi potestati subesse atque obtemperare iussit universos? Eiusmodi tuendae concordiae praecipuum et constans in eo studium fuisse, perspicue discipulus eius confirmat Thomas a Celano, qui *assiduum*, inquit, *votum vigilque studium in eo fuit custodire inter fratres vinculum pacis ut quos idem spiritus traxerat, idemque genuerat pater, unius matris gremio pacifice foverentur.*[2]

Verum satis in comperto sunt posteriores casus. Nimirum sive quod flexibiles hominum sunt voluntates et varia solent esse ingenia in congregatione plurimorum, sive quod communium temporum cursus sensim ac pedetentim alio flexisset, hoc certe usu venit franciscanis ut de instituenda vita communi aliud placeret aliis. Concordissimam illam communionem quam Franciscus spectarat et secutus erat, quamque sanctam esse apud suos voluerat, durae res potissimum continebant: studium voluntariae paupertatis, atque ipsius imitatio exemplorum in reliquarum exercitatione virtutum. Haec franciscani instituti insignia, haec eius fundamenta incolumitatis. At vero summam rerum inopiam, quam vir sanctissimus in omni vita adamavit unice, ex alumnis eius optavere nonnulli simillimam: nonnulli, quibus ea visa gravior, modice temperatam maluerunt. Quare aliorum ab aliis secessione facta, hinc *Observantes* orti, illinc *Conventuales*. Similiter rigidam innocentiam, altas magnificasque virtutes, quibus ille ad miraculum eluxerat, alii quidem imitari animose ac severe, alii lenius ac remissius velle. Ex prioribus iis fratrum *Capulatorum* familiâ coalitâ, divisio tripartita consecuta est. Non idcirco tamen exaruit Ordo: nemo est enim quin sciat, sodales singularum, quas memoravimus, disciplinarum praeclaris in Ecclesiam meritis praestitisse et fama virtutum.

De Ordini Conventualium, item de Capulatorum nihil omnino decernimus novi. Legitimum disciplinae suae ius uti possident,

1 S. Thom. 2, 2.ae, quaest. xxxvii., a.2 ad 3.um.

2 *Vita secunda*, P. iii. c. cxxi.

ita possideant utrique in posterum. Eos tantummodo hae litterae Nostrae spectant, qui concessu Sedis Apostolicae antecedunt loco et honore ceteros, quique *Fratrum Minorum* merum nomen, a Leone X. acceptum,[1] retinent. Horum quoque in aliqua parte non est omnium vita consentiens. Quandoquidem communium iussa legum universi observare studuerunt, sed aliis alii se verius. Quae res quatuor genera, ut cognitum est, effecit: *Observantes*, *Reformatos*, *Excalceatos* seu *Alcantarinos*, *Recollectos:* et tamen non sustulit funditus societatem. Quamvis enim privilegiis, statutis, varioque more altera familia ab altera differet, et cum provincias, tum domos tironum unaquaeque proprias obtineret, constanter tamen omnes, ne principium prioris coagmentationis interiret, obtemperationem uni atque eidem antistiti retinuerunt, quem *Ministrum generalem totius Ordinis Minorum*, uti ius est, vocant.[2] Utcumque sit, quadripartita istaec distributio, si maiorum spem bonorum, quam perfecta communitas attulisset, intercepit, non fregit vitae disciplinam. Quin etiam cum singulae auctores adiutoresque habuerint studiosos alienae salutis et praestanti virtute sapientiaque viros, dignae sunt habitae, quas romanorum Pontificum benevolentia complecteretur et gratia. Hoc ex capite vi et fecunditate hausta, ad fructus efferendos salutares et ad prisca franciscalium exempla renovanda valuerunt. Sed ullumne ex humanis institutis est, cui non obrepat aliquando senectus?

Certe quidem usus docet, studium virtutis perfectae, quod in ortu adolescentiaque Ordinum religiosorum solet esse severum, paullatim relaxari, atque animi ardorem pristinum plerumque succumbere vetustati. Ad hanc senescendi collabendique caussam, quam afferre consuevit aetas, quaeque omnibus est coetibus hominum natura insita, altera nunc ab inimica vi accessit extrinsecus. Scilicet atrox procella temporum, quae centum amplius annis rem catholicam exagitat, in ipsas Ecclesiae auxiliares copias, Ordines virorum religiosorum dicimus, naturali itinere redundavit. Despoliatos, pulsos, extorres, hostiliter habitos quae regio, quae ora Europae non vidit? Permagnum ac divino tribuendum muneri, quod non excisos penitus vidimus. Iamvero duabus istis coniunctis caussis plagam accepere nec sane

1 Const. *Ite et vos*, iv. kal. Iun., 1517.

2 Leon. X. Const. cit., *Ite et vos*.

levem: fieri enim non potuit quin duplicato fessa incommodo compago fatisceret, quin vis disciplinae vetus, tamquam in affecto corpore vita, debilitaretur.

Hinc instaurationis orta necessitas. Nec sane defuere in Ordinibus religiosis qui ea velut vulnera, quae diximus, sanare, et in pristinum statum restituere se sua sponte ac laudabili alacritate conati sint. Id Minores, etsi magnopere vellent, assequi tamen aut aegre aut nullo modo possunt, quia desideratur in eis conspirantium virium cumulata possessio. Revera praefecturam Ordinis gerenti non est in omnes familias perfecta atque absoluta potestas: certa quaedam eius acta et iussa repudiari privatae nonnullarum leges sinunt; ex quo perspicuum est, perpetuo patere aditum repugnantium diminicationi voluntatum. Praeterea variae sodalitates, quamquam in unum Ordinem confluunt et unum quiddam aliqua ratione efficiunt ex pluribus, tamen quia propriis provinciis differunt, domibusque ad tirocinia invicem distinguuntur, nimis est proclive factu, ut suis unaquaque rebus moveatur, seque magis ipsa quam universitatem diligat, ita ut, singulis pro se contendentibus, facile impediantur magnae utilitates communes. Denique vix attinet controversias concertationesque memorare, quas sodalitiorum varietas, dissimilitudo statutorum, disparia studia, tam saepe genuerunt, quasque caussae manentes eaedem renovare easdem in singulos propemodum dies queant. Quid autem perniciosius discordia? quae quidem ubi semel inveteravit, praecipuos vitae nervos edilit, ac res etiam florentissimas ad occasum impellit.

Igitur confirmari et corroborari Ordinem Minorum necesse est, virium dissipatione sublata: eo vel magis quod populari ingenio popularibusque moribus volvitur aetas; proptereaque expectationem sui non vulgarem sodalitium facit virorum religiosorum ortu, victu, institutis populare. Qui populares enim habentur, multo commodius et aspirare et applicare se ad multitudinem, agendo, navando pro salute communi, possunt. Hac sibi oblata bene merendi facultate Minores quidem studiose atque utiliter usuros certo scimus, si validos, si ordine dispositos, si instructos, uti par est, tempus offenderit.

Quae omnia cum apud Nos multum agitaremus animo, decessorum Nostrorum veniebat in mentem, qui incolumitati prosperitatique communi alumnorum franciscalium succurrere convenienter tempori, quoties oportuit, consuevere. Idem Nos ut simili

studio ac pari benevolentia vellemus, non solum conscientia officii, sed illae quoque caussae, quas initio diximus, impulere. Atqui omnino postulare tempus intelleximus, ut ad coniunctionem communionemque vitae priscam Ordo revocetur. Ita, amotis discidiorum et contentionum caussis, voluntates omnes unius nutu ductuque invicem colligatae tenebuntur, et, quod consequens est, erit ipsa illa, quam parens legifer intuebatur, constitutionis forma restituta.

Duas ad res cogitationem adiecimus, dignas illas quidem consideratione, quas tamen non tanti esse vidimus ut consilii Nostri retardare cursum ulla ratione possent, nimirum privilegia singulorum coetuum aboleri, et omnes quotquot ubique essent Minores, de quibus agimus, unius disciplinae legibus aeque adstringi oportere. Nam privilegia tunc certe opportuna ac frugifera cum quaesita sunt, nunc commutatis temporibus, tantum abest ut quicquam prosint religiosae legum observantiae, ut obesse videantur. Simili modo leges imponere unas universis incommodum atque intempestivum tamdiu futurum fuit, quoad varia Minorum sodalitia multum distarent interioris dissimilitudine disciplinae: contra nunc, cum non nisi pertenui discrimine invicem differant.

Nihilominus instituti et moris decessorum Nostrum memores, quia res vertebatur gravioris momenti, lumen consilii et prudentiam iudicii ab iis maxime, qui eadem de re iudicare recte possent, exquisivimus. Primum quidem cum totius Ordinis Minorum legati an. MDCCCLXXXXV Assisium in consilium convenissent, cui praeerat auctoritate Nostra b. m. Aegidius Mauri S. R. E. Cardinalis, Archiepiscopus Ferrariensis, perrogari in consilio sententias iussimus, de proposita familiarum omnium coniunctione quid singuli censerent. Faciendam frequentissimi censuerunt. Imo etiam lectis ab se ex ipso illo coetu viris hoc negotium dedere ut Constitutionum codicem perscriberent, utique communem omnibus, si communionem Sedes Apostolica sanxisset, futurum. Praeterea S. R. E. Cardinales e sacro Consilio Episcoporum atque Ordinum religiosorum negotiis praeposito, qui pariter cum S. R. E. Cardinalibus e sacro Consilio christiano nomini propagando Nobis de toto hoc negotio vehementer assenserant, acta Conventus Assisiensis et omnia rationum momenta ponderanda diligentissime curaverunt, exploratisque et emendatis, sicubi visum est, Constitutionibus novissimis, testati sunt, petere se ut Ordo, sublato familiarum discrimine, unus rite constituatur. Id

igitur omnino expedire atque utile esse, idemque cum proposito conditoris sanctissimi cumque ipsa Numinis voluntate congruere sine ulla dubitatione perspeximus.

Quae cum ita sint, auctoritate Nostra apostolica, harum virtute litterarum, Ordinem Minorum, variis ad hanc diem sodalitiis distinctum, ad unitatem communitatemque vitae plene cumulateque perfectam, ita ut unum atque unicum corpus efficiat, familiarum distinctione omni deleta, revocamus, revocatumque esse declaramus.

I. Is, extinctis nominibus *Observantium*, *Reformatorum*, *Excalceatorum* seu *Alcantarinorum*, *Recollectorum*, ORDO FRATRUM MINORUM sine ullo apposito, ex instituto Francisci patris appelletur : ab uno regatur : eisdem legibus pareat : eadem administratione utatur, ad normam Constitutionum novissimarum, quas summa fide constantiaque ab omnibus ubique servari iubemus.

II. Statuta singularia, item privilegia iuraque singularia, quibus familiae singulae privatim utebantur fruebantur, ac prorsus omnia quae differentiam aut distinctionem quoquo modo sapiant, nulla sunto : exceptis iuribus ac privilegiis adversus *tertias personas :* quae privilegia, quaeque iura firma, ut iustitia et aequitas postulaverit, rataque sunto.

III. Vestitum cultumque eâdem omnes forma induunto.

IV. In gubernatione Ordinis universi, quemadmodum unus Minister generalis, ita Procurator unus esto : item Scriba ab actis unus : honorum caelestibus habendorum Curator unus.

V. Quicumque ex hoc die minoriticas vestes rite sumpserint : quicumque maiore minoreve ritu vota nuncupaverint, eos omnes sub Constitutiones novas esse subiectos, officiisque universis, quae inde consequuntur, adstringi ius esto. Si qui Constitutionibus novis abnuat subesse, ei habitu religioso, nuncupatione votorum, professione interdictum esto.

VI. Si qua Provincia his praeceptis legibusque Nostris non paruerit, in ea nec tirocinia ponere quemquam, nec profiteri rite Ordinem liceat.

VII. Altioris perfectionis vitaeque, ut loquuntur, contemplativae cupidioribus praesto esse in provinciis singulis domum unam vel alteram in id addictam, fas esto. Eiusmodi domus iure Constitutionum novarum regantur.

VIII. Si qui e sodalibus solemni ritu professis addicere se constitutae per has litteras disciplinae iustis de caussis recusarint,

eos in domos Ordinis sui certas secedere auctoritate nutuque Antistitum liceat.

IX. Provinciarum cum mutare fines, tum minuere numerum, si necessitas coegerit, Ministro generali coniuncte cum Definitoribus generalibus liceat, perrogata tamen Definitorum Provinciarum, de quibus agatur, sententia.

X. Cum Minister generalis ceterique viri Ordini universo regundo ad hanc diem praepositi magistratu se quisque suo abdicarint, Ministrum generalem dicere auctoritatis Nostrae in caussa praesenti esse volumus. Definitores generales, ceterosque munera maiora gesturos, qui scilicet in conventu Ordinis maximo designari solent, designet in praesenti caussa sacrum Consilium Episcoporum atque Ordinum religiosorum negotiis praepositum, exquisita prius ab iis ipsis sententia, qui potestatem Definitorum generalium hodie gerunt. Interea loci Minister generalis Definitoresque generales in munere quisque versari suo pergant.

Gestit animus, quod Nostram in beatum Franciscum pietatem religionemque veterem consecrare mansuro providentiae monumento licuit: agimusque benignitati divinae gratias singulares, quod Nobis in summa senectute id solatii, percupientibus, reservavit. Quotquot autem ex Ordine Minorum sodales numerantur, pleni bonae spei hortamur obsecramusque, ut exemplorum magni parentis sui memores, ex his rebus ipsis, quas ad commune eorum bonum decrevimus, sumant alacritatem animi atque incitamenta virtutum, ut digne ambulent *vocatione, qua vocati* sunt, *cum omni humilitate, et mansuetudine, cum patientia, supportantes invicem in caritate, solliciti servare unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis.*[1]

Praesentes vero litteras et quaecumque in ipsis habentur nullo unquam tempore de subreptionis aut obreptionis sive intentionis Nostrae vitio aliove quovis defectu notari vel impugnari posse; sed semper validas et in suo robore fore et esse, atque ab omnibus cuiusvis gradus et praeeminentiae inviolabiliter in iudicio et extra observari debere, decernimus: irritum quoque et inane si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate vel praetextu, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari declarantes; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque, etiam speciali mentione dignis, quibus omnibus ex plenitudine potestatis, certa scientia et motu

1 Ephes., v., 1-3.

proprio quoad praemissa expresse derogamus, et derogatum esse declaramus.

Volumus autem, ut harum litterarum exemplis etiam impressis, manu tamen Notarii subscriptis et per constitutum in ecclesiastica dignitate virum sigillo munitis, eadem habeatur fides, quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi, his praesentibus ostensis, haberetur.

Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae constitutionis, ordinationis, unionis, limitationis, derogationis, voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerarie contraire.—Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum Quarto Nonas Octobris Anno Incarnationis Dominicae Millesimo octogesimo nonagesimo septimo, Pontificatus Nostri anno Vicesimo.

C. *Card.* ALOISI-MASSELLA, *Pro-Datarius.*

A. *Card.* MACCHI.

Visa De Curia I. De Aquila e Vicecomitibus.

Loco ✠ *Plumbi.*

Reg. in Secret. Brevium.

I. CUGNONIUS.

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

A NEW CALENDARIUM FOR THE ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. LOUIS.

It is customary with us in America as in all missionary countries, where there are no liturgical traditions, that several dioceses use the same *Ordo divini officii recitandi.* The Calendar with the nineteen *officia propria* approved in 1840, and the four new feasts in honor of the American Saints granted to the United States in 1885, is used extensively in the East and South. In 1862, Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, published a new Calendar for the ecclesiastical Province over which he presided. That Calendarium is being followed at present in twenty dioceses of the Central States. All the Ordos, particularly the one used in the Eastern Provinces, are meagre in special feasts; and since no addition can be made to any of them, except by a joint petition of all the bishops in whose dioceses it is used, the chances to enrich it are very poor.

For this reason, when during the preparatory sessions for the St. Louis diocesan synod, in spring 1896, the question of the *Ordo* came up, it was deemed expedient to take an initiative for the adoption of a Calendarium which would be richer and more in accordance with the liturgical customs of other countries at the present time. As a consequence, the Archbishop of St. Louis had in the fall of 1896 a *Schema* of a new Calendarium prepared, which was presented to the Congregation of Sacred Rites. The latter approved it with but slight change, on April 26, 1897.

With the feasts granted to the United States in 1840 and 1885, and those adopted for St. Louis in 1862, the new *Proprium* of St. Louis contains the following proper feasts:

JANUARY.

23. Desponsatio B.M.V. dupl. maj. Comm. S. Joseph.
30. S. Hyacinthae de Mariscottis v. dupl.

FEBRUARY.

3. S. Blasii ep. et m. duplex (instead of simplex).
5. S. Philippia Jesu m. dupl.
11. Apparitionis B.M.V. Immaculatae, dupl. maj.
12. S. Ildephonsi ep. c. duplex.
13. S. Catharinae de Ricciis v. duplex.
14. S. Joannis Eleemosynarii ep. c. duplex.
15. S. Joseph a Leonissa c. duplex.
16. B. Joannae Valeriae, vid., dupl.
17. Fugae D. N. J. Ch. in Aegyptum, dupl. maj.
18. SS. Mart. Japonensium, duplex.
26. S. Margaritae Corton. poenit. semi-d.
28. Inventio Pueri Jesu, dupl. maj.

MARCH.

5. S. Joannis Josephi a Cruce conf. dupl.
6. S. Fridolini abb. dupl.
9. S. Gregorii Nysseni ep. c. dupl.
18. S. Gabrielis arch. dupl. maj.
22. S. Catharinae de Genna vid. dupl.

APRIL.

3. S. Mariae Aegyptianae poen. dupl.
6. B. Julianae Cornelion. virg. dupl.
16. S. Benedicti Joseph Labre c. dupl.
19. S. Leonis IX. Pp. c. dupl.
26. B. M. V. de Bono Consilio, dupl. maj.
27. S. Turibii ep. c. dupl.

MAY.

11. S. Francisci de Hieronymo c. dupl.
13. S. Boni Latroni c. dupl.
14. Conversio S. Augustini ep. c. doct. dupl.
15. S. Isidori agric. dupl.
16. S. Joannis Nepomuceni m. dupl.
21. S. Felicis a Cantalicio c. dupl.
24. B. V. M. tit. Auxilium Christianorum, dupl. maj.
26. S. Philippi Nerii c. dupl. 2. classis (instead of dupl).
27. Patrocinium S. Ludovici Regis c. dupl. maj.
30. S. Ferdinandi III. Regis c. dupl.
31. B. M. V. tit. Regina Sanctorum Omnium et Mater Pulchrae Dilectionis, dupl. 2. classis.

JUNE.

9. B. M. V. tit. Mater Gratiarum, dupl. maj.
12. S. Leonis III. Pp. c. dupl.
16. S. Joannis Francisci Regis c. dupl.
17. Humilitatis B. M. V. dupl. maj.

JULY.

4. S. Irenaei ep. m. dupl.
7. S. Petri Forerii c. dupl.
9. Prodigiorum B. M. V. dupl. maj.
11. S. Michaelis de Sanctis c. dupl.
19. S. Vincentii a Paulo c. Patroni min. princip. dupl. 2. cl. cum oct.
21. SS. Martyrum Gorcomiensium, dupl.
24. S. Francisci Solani c. dupl.
27. S. Eliae prophetae, dupl.

AUGUST.

9. S. Pulcheriae Imperatr. v. dupl.
11. S. Philumenae v. m. dupl.
18. S. Helenae Imperatr. vid. dupl.
19. S. Tharsicii Acolythi m. dupl.

25. S. Ludovici Regis c. Titul. Cathedr. et Civit. atque Archidioec. Patroni Princ. dupl. 1. cl. cum oct.
26. S. Samuelis Prophetae, dupl.
30. S. Rosae Limanae v. dupl. 2. classis (instead of duplex).

SEPTEMBER.

1. Octava S. Ludovici c. 1 dupl.
3. B.M.V. tit. Consolatrix Afflictorum, dupl. maj.
4. S. Rosae Viterb. v. dupl.
6. S. Rosaliae v. semi-d.
9. S. Petri Claver c. dupl.

OCTOBER.

1. S. Gregorii ep. Majoris Armeniae m. dupl.
2. SS. Angelorum Custodum, dupl. 2. classis cum oct. (instead of dupl. maj).
3. S. Remigii ep. c. duplex (instead of semi-d. ad libitum).
8. S. Simeonis Prophetae, dupl.
9. Octava SS. Angelorum Custodum, duplex.
10. S. Ludovici Bertr. c. dupl.
16. S. Galli abb. dupl.
17. B. Mariae Margar. Alacoque v. dupl.
21. SS. Ursulae et Soc. vv. mm. dupl.
23. SS. Redemptoris, dupl. maj.
24. S. Raphaelis arch. dupl. maj.
27. Puritatis B.M.V. dupl. maj.
29. S. Bedae Venerabilis c. dupl.
31. S. Wolfgangi ep. c. dupl.

NOVEMBER.

13. S. Stanislai c. dupl.
17. S. Gregorii Thaumat. ep. c. dupl. (instead of semi-d).
27. Manifestationis Imm. Virg. Mariae a Sacro Numismate, dupl. maj.
28. S. Leonardi a Portu Maur. c. dupl.

DECEMBER.

5. S. Barbarae v. m. dupl. (instead of simpl.).
10. Transl. Domus Lauretanae B.M.V. dupl. maj.
12. B.M.V. de Guadalupe, dupl. maj.
17. S. Lazari ep. c. dupl.
18. Expectatio Partus B.M.V. dupl. maj.

MOVABLE FEASTS.

Dom. III. post Epiph.: SS. Familiae, dupl. maj.

Dom. ultima post Epiph.: SS. Immaculati Cordis B. M. V. titulo Refugium Peccatorum, dupl. maj.

All the seven feasts of the Passion of Christ, as given in the Appendix of the Roman Breviary.

Feria II. p. Dom. in Albis : Gaudiorum B. M. V. dupl. 2. classis.

Feria VI. p. Dom. in Albis: S. Sepulchri D. N. J. Ch. dupl. maj.

Dom. II. post Pascha : B. M. V. tit. Mater Divini Pastoris, dupl. maj. Com. Transl. reliqu. S. Vincentii a Paulo c.

Dom. infra Oct. Ascens.: B. M. V. tit. Regina Apostolorum, dupl. maj.

Dom. ante 24 Iunii: B. M. V. tit. de Perpetuo Succursu, dupl. maj.

Dom. I. post 6. Iulii : Omnium SS. Rom. Eccl. Summorum Pontificum, dupl. maj.

Dom. ultima Iulii : B. M. V. tit. Auxilium Agonizantium, dupl. maj.

Dom. II. Aug.: B. M. V. tit. Salus Infirmorum, dupl. maj.

Dom. post Oct. Assumpt.: Purissimi Cordis B. M. V., dupl. maj.

Dom. II. Oct.: Maternitatis B. M. V., dupl. maj.

Dom. III. Oct.: Dedicatio Eccl. Metropolitanae, dupl. 1. cl. cum oct.

Dom. ultima Oct.: SS. Reliquiarum, dupl. maj.

Dom. infra Oct. Omn. SS.: B. M. V. de Suffragio Animarum, dupl. maj.

Dom. post Oct. Omn. SS.: Patrocinii B. M. V., dupl. maj.

At the same time the faculty has been granted to the Archdiocese of St. Louis, to transfer to the next free day all secondary feasts, affixed to Sundays or weekdays whenever these cannot be celebrated on their own day by reason of some other feast occurring.

F. G. H.

St. Louis, Mo.

CRIME AND HEREDITY.

REPLY OF THE REV. DR. BARRY TO "AN INQUIRER."[1]

To the Editor AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

REV. SIR:—As the main purpose of my articles on Lombroso was to draw attention and invite discussion, it is gratifying to find that they are likely to do both. The school of criminology which Lombroso may be said to have instituted, and to which, at all events, he has given the widest renown, is spread through all countries; it has a literature which is daily growing in extent and variety; it colours public opinion, and is in high repute with many social reformers. No other name at once and immediately suggests the matter with which in my articles I was dealing, viz., the doctrine of crime as a natural product, and the method of "social defence." That is why it seemed to me the shortest and simplest way into the whole question to sum up what Lombroso maintains. But, of course, I am not his apologist.

Your learned correspondent who asks "Is there no hope for the born-delinquent?" now carries his enquiry one step farther. In so doing, he cannot fail to elicit more facts, and to throw light on these perplexed and difficult problems. Can we persuade him, as a prison-chaplain with unusual opportunities of information, to add some details of his experience, and the methods of discipline and reform which he would favour? Within the last few days, I have received from one of the most competent authorities in England a letter in which he says,—and I think, in so saying, he strikes

1 See November number of the REVIEW, p. 534.

a note with which Catholics may safely agree,—"In my opinion, many of Lombroso's positions have been shattered by criticism. But his fundamental position is unassailable, namely, that crime must be studied in the first place from what he calls an anthropological point of view; or as I should say, from the individual and social institutions which produce the criminal." This is to consider environment and heredity as determining conditions, though they need not be irresistible causes, of crime; it is to undertake a more thorough, and certainly a more humane, method of handling the criminal than mere punishment as now inflicted, or the superficial system of the prison-school, so long in fashion.

The "suppression of the born-delinquent," though a phrase occurring in Lombroso, does not mean in his mouth any extension of the penalty of death, but a protest against the Italian Code which has abolished that penalty. My notion is that Lombroso would be much less severe on this head than the English and American judges are in practice; and it must be observed that he does not propose to treat any one as a delinquent on account of his *stigmata*, but only to consider these marks, after crime proved, in the sentence which has to be pronounced and the precautions to be taken on behalf of society. His suggestions may demand very careful revision; but they indicate the use of "anthropology" as a help towards protecting the criminal from himself, and others from him.

It is obvious that even if a "criminal type" exists, the Catholic priest and philanthropist will always presume free will, full responsibility, and possible reformation, until the contrary is shown. He will believe in the miracles of conversion; he will resort to the supernatural means given him by religion where science fails; but he will also apply the principle of "avoiding the occasion" socially as well as individually; and he may arrive at the conclusion that there are members of the human race,—few or many, according to the evidence,—who can only be saved from criminal relapses by being treated all their lives as minors, and kept under legal surveillance. That, in my view, is the practical ques-

tion which emerges from the whole state of the case. Will it be met by a much more extensive development of "The Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society?" How little, in fact, such prisoners are aided, your correspondent points out. It is a subject on which a great deal might be said which I shall now pass over.

But as regards the heredity of crime, and its physical, mental and moral antecedents, I may be allowed to quote from an important volume on "Juvenile Offenders," lately published by the Rev. W. D. Morrison, Chaplain of Wandsworth Gaol. (New York, Appleton & Co.) "Whether we look at the Old World or the New," Mr. Morrison observes (p. 17), "juvenile crime is a problem which is not decreasing in magnitude with the march of civilisation. Every civilised community is confronted with it in a more or less menacing form." What are its causes? The author does not pretend to exhaust them, but he writes, "Innate disposition, parental example, social surroundings, social habits, the presence of temptation and opportunity, all play a more or less prominent part in determining the extent and intensity of crime." The old habitual offender, he goes on to say (p. 83)—the "criminal by profession,"—"almost invariably begins his career in early youth;" and (p. 85) "it is probable that certain conditions of a more or less pathological character may also play an important part in moving the springs of conduct in a criminal direction." To ascertain whether this surmise be justified, the author examines a mass of evidence, mostly official, derived from the reformatory and industrial schools of Great Britain. He concludes, in general (p. 92), that "we must expect to find a large number of the delinquent population in industrial schools burdened with diseased and debilitated constitutions;" that (p. 99) "as a class, juvenile offenders are distinctly more degenerate than the rest of the community," and that "in many cases the physical infirmities of the parents have been handed down to the children." Moreover (p. 107), while "a large percentage of juvenile offenders are in this condition of imperfect development and depressed vitality," if we

"estimate their mental competence by the physical basis on which it reposes," we shall conclude that "at least a third of these juveniles are below the average healthy standard in general mental power." And with respect to this 33 per cent. (p. 112), "estimating the mental competence of criminal children by the mental status of the parents, it was shown that most of these children were descended from parents who were either mentally or morally unqualified to perform the elementary duties of parenthood." But even more strongly on p. 111, "In other words, the weakness of will in the parent reappears in the child in the form of an absence of power to resist criminal instincts and impulses." Finally (p. 114–115), "the mental characteristics of the parents of most juvenile offenders" consist of "mental incompetence and moral obliquity." It is, therefore, in such "an atmosphere" that "the mind of the juvenile offender receives its earliest impressions of the external world." Some offenders may, indeed, be "alert enough mentally, and even above the average in this respect," but in them "there is often an absence of feeling which is truly remarkable . . . Such children are well aware of the nature of a criminal conduct, but it is not in any way repugnant to them on that account. It is from their ranks that the most dangerous class of habitual criminals are drawn. On the other hand, children of feeble wills are often gifted with genuine sensibilities, and when they fall, it is because they are led away by others . . . These children are generally below the average in intellect as well as in will; and are good or bad according to the circumstances in which they happen to be placed." (p. 116.)

On the whole, Mr. Morrison, while abstaining from minute physiological description, and altogether independent of Lombroso, would seem, in these quotations, to favour the idea of a "criminal type," which has its recognisable features, physical no less than mental, and which is capable of transmission by heredity. Yet, in his view, as in ours, while it must be granted (p. 83) that "once the mind has acquired a rigid criminal bent, the task of reformation becomes

difficult in the extreme," still, if that task is undertaken "before criminal tendencies have become solidified into fixed criminal habits, it is certain, if properly conducted, to lead to a satisfactory amount of success."

WILLIAM BARRY.

Dorchester, England.

A BOY BAPTIZING HIMSELF.

A remarkable incident occurred to me a short time ago. I was sitting in the little parlor of our rectory reciting the Office when a lady, without being announced, entered through the open hall and said in a somewhat haughty tone: "Sir, I want to be baptized. I am not a Catholic, and do not believe in your Church, but I have a superstitious feeling about baptism and am told that you can administer it." Her words and the cold business-like manner in which they were said tempted me to make some cynical reply, but she was dressed in deep mourning which somehow provoked respect or sympathy in me, and bidding her be seated I explained what baptism meant and that I could not impart it to her unless she believed in the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

"Could a person who is not baptized himself, baptize me?" she queried.—"Yes."—"But I must believe?"—"Yes."—"That is right," she continued, "then my boy died a Catholic. He baptized himself. Give me one of your books and I shall try to believe if I can." She then told me how her little boy sometime before his death called her to his side and said, "Mamma, I feel as if I was going to die. Don't be displeased with me for saying it, for I love you very much, but I want to be baptized." The mother, having no religion and not wishing to foster the notion of death in the child's mind, put him off with the remark that he was not going to die, and that if he was, she would baptize him if it gave him any pleasure. Inwardly she blamed the Catholic nurse who, she had no doubt, had influenced the child with this notion, and though she highly valued the girl on other grounds, she thought it wise to remove her forthwith from the house. One evening after that the boy called her and asked for some water. Thinking he was thirsty, she brought it; but he seemed to wish to bathe his hands, and taking some of the water with his feeble hand he put it on his forehead

saying : I baptize myself in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. She did not exactly remember the words he said, but she knew he had baptized himself, and gently chiding him—here she burst into tears, arose and left me almost abruptly. She never returned ; and I do not know where she came from or whether she lived in our neighborhood, which I doubt.

What I ask is this : Was that child baptized? Can a person baptize himself validly ? And if not, why not? If the mother came back wishing to become a Catholic, and should ask me to say an anniversary Mass for her boy, should I refuse on the plea that the Church does not admit as valid a baptism administered by one self, and that she does not pray for those in limbo, because they can never attain the beatific vision ?

Resp. The form in which the Sacrament of Baptism was instituted implies a necessary distinction between the person administering and the object (materia) upon which the sacramental virtue is to act, in the same way as a subject cannot be regarded as active and passive under one and the same respect. The form "Ego *te* baptizo," etc., indicates that this distinction is essential in the administration of the Sacrament. But the question has in reality no practical bearing, because any person who should sincerely attempt to baptize himself, would receive the grace of baptism, that is to say —salvation, not through the sacrament of faith, but through his faith in the Sacrament. Innocent III. mentions the case of a Jew, who, thinking he was about to die and having been instructed in the rudiments of faith, baptized himself. "Had he died immediately," says the Pontiff, "he would have at once entered heaven, non propter fidei sacramentum sed propter sacramenti fidem." (Decr. iii. t. 42, cap. 4.)

THE CROSSES IN THE "VIA CRUCIS."

Qu. Please to state whether it is necessary to place wooden crosses above or below the stations of the "via crucis" in order to gain the indulgences attached to the devotion. I have seen stations carved in wood which had no crosses, but which were blessed by a religious

who said that it was sufficient to have a cross attached to the first station.

Resp. Unless an unusual privilege had been granted in the case of the above-mentioned religious his blessing of the stations was invalid, so far as the gaining of the indulgences attached to the devout exercise of the "via crucis" is concerned.

According to the *Decreta authentica* (261–270–258, etc.), and to the *Acta Ord. Min.*, 1893, the fourteen crosses of wood are *essential.* They are usually placed above the images representing the scene of the Passion commemorated at each of the stations, but they may be placed below or aside of them, in such a way as to be visible. The *images* are merely intended to help the imagination to concentrate devotion, and are *not* necessary for the valid erection of the "via crucis."

The fourteen crosses *must* be blessed. The images *may* be blessed; for which purpose the Ritual gives a distinct form.

The blessing of the crosses may be performed either before they are put up, or after they are placed on the wall. The priest who blesses them need not himself put them up, although he must bless them in the place where they are to be located (Acta S. Sedis, xxv. 317).

THE SEVENTH CANDLESTICK ON THE PONTIFICAL ALTAR.

Qu. We are placing a new altar in the Cathedral, and do not find anywhere clear direction as to the location of the seventh candlestick required in the celebration of Pontifical Mass. The several altars in other Cathedrals which our architect has examined, seem to have no special provision for the pontifical celebration. What is the proper arrangement?

Resp. The only requisite in the construction of an altar on which Pontifical Mass is to be celebrated is that the platform on which the candlesticks for Mass are placed be sufficiently wide in the centre to admit the crucifix in front of the central (seventh) candlestick. According to Catalani

(Comment. Lib. I., § xii., n. 1) the seven candlesticks are to be "*post crucem locata*, et magis parieti proximata, ita ut imagines proximiores sint celebranti." They are to be in one line, rising toward the centre.

7

o o O O O o o

✠

When the seventh candlestick is removed, as in Requiem Masses, the crucifix is put back in its usual place *between* the six candlesticks. (Hence the crucifix on episcopal altars should not be an irremovable one.)

o o O ✠ O o o

The same is expressed by Martinucci (IV. lib. v., cap. 9, not. 18) in the following quaint wording: "ponenda est crux ante candelabra, nec septimum candelabrum ponendum est post crucem."

When there is a tabernacle, as in the case of Gothic altars, which prevents this arrangement from being carried out, that which comes nearest to it, is the only one to be suggested; provided the seventh candlestick overtop the others and leave the cross in front of it.

THE PRAYERS IN THE FORM OF ABSOLUTION.

Qu. You are kindly requested to give a definite answer to the following question:

With regard to the form of sacramental absolution, can the prayers *Misereatur*, etc., *Indulgentiam*, etc., and *Passio Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, etc., be always omitted *absque peccato?*

SACERDOS.

Resp. The prayers *Misereatur*, etc., as part of the ordinary form of sacramental absolution are *laudabiliter addenda* (Conc. Trid.), and are therefore never of obligation *sub peccato.* But the habitual omission of an act not prescribed *sub peccato* may nevertheless become a sin, not by reason of the omission but by reason of the degree of contempt which prompts the habitual omission and sets aside a wish of the

Church to confer graces at our command. That the Church positively wishes confessors to use the invocation in connection with the sacramental form of absolution is plain from the words of the Ritual stating the reason for *sometimes* omitting it.

The wording of the query appears to indicate a desire on the part of *Sacerdos* to have simply *yes* or *no* for reply, so as to settle the contention once and for all. That is as impossible as if one had to answer definitely some such question as: Are Catholics obliged in conscience to pay a dollar at the monthly school collection?

THE CORRECT PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

Qu. My assistant and I have all along maintained a slight difference in the pronunciation of Latin; one of us having been accustomed to the manner of the Roman Seminary, the other retaining the ordinary Continental pronunciation taught in most of our colleges. Recently there seems to have been some reform in this matter, and as a consequence we have had to submit to some criticism, not only from a college professor in a neighboring institution, but from various half-fledged blue-stockings who devote themselves to a revival of antique letters and who advance clever reasons for saying *Kikero* instead of the old fashioned *Cicero.* They are particularly incensed against the Italian pronunciation, calling it absurd, artificial and justifiable only for Italians, who find it convenient because of their own language. No Roman of the Augûstan age, they say, ever pronounced *tshivitas* for *civitas.*

Now, whilst I do not want to be behindhand in proper culture, I dislike the idea of introducing in the public service the chant "Qui es in koelis; sanctifiketur nomen tuum, etc.," which would certainly arrest the attention of the congregation, and suggest the idea of affectation or the like. What are really the merits of the case? And is there any right reason for our adopting this Augustan pronunciation, which, if done, should, it seems to me, be done by all the clergy together?

Resp. There is just a trifle of arrogant ignorance in the attempt to render the Italian pronunciation of Latin absurd

or to substitute for it any other. No doubt, the new pronunciation is either that of the Augustan age or comes near to it, and very likely the friends of Cicero called him Kikero after the fashion of the Greeks. But that is a matter which concerns the Latin grammarian or the archeologist.

The Latin language, as far as it is to-day a living, that is to say a *spoken* language, is the language of the Catholic Church, of her clergy and of her international institutions. Now the pronunciation of a living language is not regulated by reference to any literary standard of the past. We consider Shakespeare and Milton worthy of attentive study in our schools, but if anyone attempted to argue that we should adopt the pronunciation of two or three hundred years ago we should consider the claim absurd. Usage is the law of correct speech; and when there is question of correct pronunciation we usually refer to some recognized centre of converse, where good usage has fixed the mode of speech, such as Paris, or Dublin, or Florence for the respective languages used there. The recognized centre of the Latin language, as far as it is a *spoken* and living idiom, is Rome. From Rome and to Rome lead all the roads in which the Latin language is heard, sung and spoken, in the elegant phrase of the classic scholar or in the medieval simplicity of the friars' jargon. Is it then strange that we should suit our speech to the manner of that great centre?

To say that it has changed some of its sounds is arguing nothing against its legitimate use. What language has not changed in two thousand years? Is there any that has changed so little? And if so, is it not due to the fact that the Latin Church, which claims the right of its present pronunciation, has spoken it all these centuries and preserved its living character?

On the other hand, the dilettante, the antiquarian, the student who pursues language as a literary curiosity or as a help to thoughtfulness, has a perfect right to inquire how Cicero or Chaucer or Shakespeare spoke, and to imitate the diction of these authors in all particulars. Their wisdom is misplaced only when they wish to force their views on the old

Church and her habits. She was in possession long, long ago; she cultivated that language—the language of the Church by common consent—for practical living use, neglecting neither the classic grace of its golden age, as exemplified in Hilary of Poitiers, or Damasus, or Gregory, nor the rustic simplicity which made it an easy means of intercourse with the unlettered. Leo XIII. to-day imitates with matchless power the sweetly flowing alcaics of Horace, and gives them at the same time that originality which stamps their worth as separate works of art. To accept the Pope's Latin is as natural as to accept the Queen's English.

So let the collegians have their archaic way; but we shall claim the speech of our great city, Rome, as by right and title that of the Latin Republic in letters or out of them. For the rest, the matter has never troubled the Church, who has left each one to indulge his peculiar taste.

THE UNIFICATION OF THE FRANCISCAN ORDERS.

By a new Apostolic Constitution issued on the feast of St. Francis of Assisi, the Holy Father inaugurates a change in the government and constitution of the four religious communities known as the *Observantists*, *Reformed Friars Minor*, *Discalced* (barefooted) *Franciscans* and *Recollects*. These Orders, which are offshoots from the original institute founded by St. Francis, have had hitherto distinct autonomy, customs and privileges. Henceforth they are to be united under the same rule and constitutions, and governed by one Minister General.

This is an important change, and implies a decided reform in many respects of some of the existing communities, all of which are hereafter to bear the name of *Friars Minor* (Minorites); they are to wear the same habit, take the same obligations, and relinquish all distinctive privileges.

The two Orders of *Conventuals* and *Capuchins*, likewise governed by the Franciscan rule, remain distinct, as heretofore.

CANDIDATES FOR THE ELECTION OF THE PAPAL OFFICE.

Qu. In Baart's *The Roman Court* I read that "any man, even a layman and a married person may validly be elected Sovereign Pontiff." Is this statement true? The author makes no qualification.

Resp. The statement is true only theoretically. St. Peter was married and became Pope afterwards; and a similar case is conceivable in the future. Practically, however, legislation and prescriptive custom put such a contingency out of the question. A decree of Pope Stephen III. ordained that only a member of the Roman *clergy* was eligible to the office of Sovereign Pontiff. This decree was violated some centuries later by the election of John XIX. Pope Nicolas II. reinforced the decree and at the same time reserved the electoral privilege exclusively to the College of Cardinals. During the following three centuries, *i. e.*, to Urban VI. (1378), nine pontiffs were elected who had not been cardinals at the time of the election. Since then, that is to say during the last *five hundred* years, the Pope has always been elected from the members of the College of Cardinals;[1] and Benedict XIV., without making a law to this effect, has practically prescribed it as the norm to be observed for all future time: "Congruum omnino ut ex eis (cardinalibus) S. Pontifex desumatur." (De Serv. Dei beat. iii., c. 33).

THE BISHOP'S NAME IN THE CANON OF THE MASS.

Qu. In the Canon of the Mass should a bishop mention his own name or that of his metropolitan?

Resp. The Bishop, if he is the *Ordinary* of a diocese, says instead of "antistite nostro N."—*et me indigno servo tuo.* (Vide. *Rit. celebr. Miss.*, *viii.*, 2.) If he is a Coadjutor or Auxiliary he mentions the name of his Ordinary. If there is no Ordinary the phrase is omitted altogether.

1 See Lucius Lector: *Le Conclave*, Paris; Lethielleux. 1894.

ONE SPONSOR FOR EACH OF THE "CONFIRMANDI."

Qu. I am told that the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW is authority for the statement that there must be a sponsor for *each* person to be confirmed. This is very inconvenient and contrary to custom in America. I think the Editor of the REVIEW might find reasons enough to prove that European notions don't fit our conditions. The Church with her Sacraments is for the people, and not the people for the Church.

Resp. The *Council of Baltimore*, following the Decrees of Trent, is authority for the statement that there must be a sponsor for each person to be confirmed. We called attention to the fact some months ago, because the *Manual of Ceremonies for the Episcopal Visitation of Parishes and the Administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation* had left the matter in doubt, as though it were optional to have one or more sponsors for all the persons to be confirmed. In the *new edition* of the Manual, in preparation now, the error will be corrected.

For the rest, our correspondent is evidently of the liberal school which practically holds the principle that liturgical discipline is regulated by local convenience and modern ideas. Assuredly the Church is for the people, but so are her *laws*; and laws are *not notions*. That the laws of the *Roman* Catholic Church should come from Europe is a sort of geographical necessity.

THE *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ*.

Qu. What is the value from a scriptural point of view of the recently discovered papyrus called "The Sayings of Christ?" From what is being said in the newspapers one would almost suppose that this "find" outranks the Gospels in importance.

Resp. The literary and apologetic value of the "Logia" lately found in Behnesa has been greatly exaggerated. It

consists of a single sheet (papyrus), about six or seven inches by four, of Greek uncial writing. The following is a facsimile:—



Some estimate of the restored characters may be gleaned from the first verse which reads:

. . . ΚΑΙ ΤΟΤΕ ΔΙΑΒΛΕΨΕΙΣ
ΕΚΒΑΛΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΚΑΡΦΟΣ
ΤΟ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΩ
ΤΟΥ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΥ ΣΟΥ—

One of the later translations of the entire fragment is as follows:

. . . And then thou shalt see how to withdraw the mote from thy brother's eye.

Jesus says: If you do not fast from (separate from the ways of) the world, you shall not find the kingdom of heaven; and if you do not observe the Sabbath you shall not see the Father.

Jesus says: I was in the midst of the world, and I have been seen in the flesh by them, and I found them all glutted, and none among them did I find changed. And: My soul is grieved over the children of men because they are blinded in their heart, and . . . . . poverty.

Jesus says: There where they are united I am likewise; if there is but one of them alone, I am with him. Lift up the stone and there thou wilt find me, divide the wood and I shall still be there.

Jesus says: Neither is a prophet accepted in his own land, nor does a physician make health among those with whom he dwells.

Jesus says: A city built on the top of a high mountain and strengthened, cannot be destroyed nor be hidden.

Jesus says: Thou hearest . . .

According to Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, who discovered the fragment among other papers buried on the site of the ancient Oxyrrinchos (about 120 miles south of Cairo), the Logia may have been written about the middle of the second century, or even later. To assume that it is part of an original which served the evangelists for the composition of their Gospels is without any foundation. Numberless persons made, no doubt, notes of what they had heard either from the lips of our Lord or from the Apostles and disciples, and there is nothing strange in the assumption that such notes were used as reminders before the Gospels had sufficiently spread for the

general knowledge. Even the sacred writers may have had such notes and used them; but they did not depend on them for the composition of the Gospels, and the existence of such memoranda, even if genuine, contributes but little to the trustworthiness of the inspired records, the historical value of which is amply established, so as to convince any reasonable person who is disposed to accept legal testimony.

THE CRUX "IMMISSA."

Qu. In an old treatise (without title-page or date) on the liturgy of the Church, which I picked up in an antiquary book shop, there is repeated mention of a *crux immissa,* so called apparently to distinguish it from other kinds of *cruces.* I cannot anywhere find an explanation of the term. May I ask the editor of the REVIEW for information?

Resp. Some old liturgical writers use the term "crux *immissa*" to designate + as distinguished from the "crux *commissa*" T, and the "crux *decussata*" ×. The explanation may be found in most works on Christian archeology.

BOOK REVIEW.

MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE. The Basis of Medical Jurisprudence. By the Rev. Chas. Coppens, S.J.—Benziger Bros. New York, 1897. Pp. 222. Pr. $1.50.

In American Catholic literature, I dare say in English Catholic literature, this work fills a real need. Not that there were no manuals, or elaborate treatises on the same subject before,—Father Coppens himself acquaints us with the literature accessible to students of medicine in the United States—but there is none so pronouncedly Christian, so soundly Catholic. It will help to remove a stubborn prejudice, as though Catholic morality were a mere matter of ceremonial observance. It will give a clue to the solution of most difficult problems in the prevention and cure of evil, both physical and moral.

The special aim of the lectures embodied in the book, and delivered by Father Coppens to medical students, is understood from the very title. The author himself, "impressed with the dignity and the importance of the matter," wishes "to avoid all danger of misunderstanding," and distinctly styles his "Moral Principles and Medical Practice" "the Basis of Medical Jurisprudence." Hitherto, he tells us, that department "regulated the conduct of practitioners by human, positive laws, and sanctioned acts because they were not condemned by civil courts." The enactments of civil courts, human laws, must be regulated, however, by "the first principles of right and wrong."

Our author studies the divine law, or, as it is sometimes called, the natural law, in its source, and makes it the starting-point as well as the guide in his conclusions. Dealing with man's body, primarily indeed, medicine would seem to abstract from qualities that make it part and parcel of human nature. But both the practitioner of medicine and the patient are moral agents. "Duty and conscientious regard for the higher law of morality" are incumbent on both; hence that law must be the basis of their operation.

"The goodness and the evil of human acts," however, observes the author, "is not dependent on human legislation alone ; in many cases the moral good or evil is so intrinsic to the very nature of the acts that God Himself could not change the radical difference between them." Throughout his instructions he shows how the civil or common law harmonizes with Christian ethics, pointing out the disastrous results if ever laws should be promulgated that depart from sound reasoning, or contravene natural law defined by Christian morality. Unhappily, half-settled theories already exercise an influence on legislative and executive bodies here and elsewhere. "The philosophy of every day" is becoming a very uncertain thing. Undue stress appears to be laid upon certain theories as to the causes of the various forms of insanity, assigned by Lombroso and others with slight differences. The irresponsible results of moral insanity, particularly of nymphomania, as Krafft-Ebbing accounts for them ; the pathology of the nerves and muscles, or of emotion as Ribot insists, are much pressed into public notice. Since there is some truth in all these speculations, great caution is necessary to avoid hurried, unconsidered destruction of previous laws. It is therefore emphatically true that "with no other class of men does the performance of duty depend more on personal integrity" than with physicians ; and "a goodly supply of conscientious physicians," it is ardently to be wished, may continue in our country. In the chapter on "excesses" we find principles and just conclusions that give the lie to the scurrilous remarks of Krafft-Ebbing on certain incidents in the lives of the saints. One would almost wish the author had more forcibly impressed it on his students to study and ponder the advice to be given to young and unmarried persons with regard to preventives and remedies against venereal excesses. An eminent physician considers the alarming increase and terrible results of such excesses one of the most prevalent diseases to be remedied nowadays. And it is harder to cure the unhappy victims, he said, than to cure dipsomania.

Two important chapters are those which deal with the "Nature of Insanity" and the "Legal Aspects of Jurisprudence." What the future may disclose in this matter cannot be definitely stated, but certainly the principles to be used will not be shaken even by Lombroso's "Criminal Anthropology Applied to Pedagogy." "Psychology," "states of feeling," studied on the principles of the "intellectual thesis," or on those of the "physiological thesis," to use Ribot's terms, will never subvert principles of natural law. These

principles are both indicated and exemplified by Fr. Coppens. "The will being a spiritual power can no more be diseased than can the intellect;" still man's passions, which are also organic powers common to us and to brute animals, can become disordered by bodily disease, but "in such disease the will remains free."

In the ninth and last lecture the author discusses "Hypnotism and the Border-Land of Science." He calls attention to a truth of Christian faith in connection with that subject that ought to be more frequently inculcated at the present time. The truth is, there is another order of spirits, good and evil, whose interaction in the providence of the Supreme Ruler is always a possible cause to be remembered by those who study in the "Border Land of Science." "The humbuggery" is not so thorough as to leave no room for a medium between tangible nature and fraud or forgery. "The refusal to believe in devils," the author remarks, "does not prove that there are none." The priest knows sufficiently well that whoever should "assert that spiritism, table-turning, spirit-rapping, and so on, are mere idle talk, sheer impostures, is not well read in the literature of the present day." It was not the author's duty, however, to designate the criteria whereby his readers might detect the real cause operating in each case. Indeed it may not be an easy work to apply such criteria in the concrete. The very "deviltry" may consist in the delusion itself, as we have had it in the Taxil-Vaughan farce. The priest, however, knows how difficult it is in many instances to disengage human curiosity, and to point out the, to him, palpable absurdity of such practices. Yet here precisely lies, in great part, the duty of the clergy as well as the press. Decrease of faith brings an increase of superstition, and, God knows, faith is growing weak.

Whilst the danger of hypnotism is pointed out to the medical student, its remedial value is not ignored. Moralists have in a manner agreed upon allowing its practice under necessary precautions. But experts in moral as well as in civil law are guided in their opinions in this matter by medical research. Hence Father Coppens invites further "study of hypnotism, which is still so imperfectly understood," and he believes "valuable service to humanity, and in particular to the science of medicine," would accrue.

We possess, as has already been intimated, a number of text-books on Pastoral Theology and Pastoral Medicine. Since the Trappist Debreyne, whilom doctor of medicine and professor of practical medicine in Paris, published his study on Pastoral Medi-

cine, much has been written by Catholic physicians in Germany, France, and Italy, even in America, to mention only the work of Dr. Cook, giving indirect information on medical jurisprudence also ; but no such clear exposition of principles governing medical jurisprudence itself, as that contained in the book before us, has been offered from a Catholic point of view.

The eight lectures, in which the principles pointed out in the first are applied, do not indeed cover the whole ground of medical jurisprudence, nor exhaust the topics touched by the author. But they are complete in the sense that they give the key, and, in a way, the solution of practical cases ; which fact makes the book eminently useful for the pastor of souls, who, by his very office of mediator, is brought into close contact with civil and with medical law. His judgment and direction in moral action must frequently be dependent on his knowledge of the peculiar laws to which his client, as citizen and as patient, is subject. He will find somewhat to learn, therefore, in these lectures on "Craniotomy" and "Abortion ;" the "Views," too, "of Scientists and Sciolists" on these subjects and on "Venereal Excesses" cannot be indifferent to him ; while the "Physician's Professional Rights and Duties" may not interest him so much, the "Nature of Insanity," the "Legal Aspects of Insanity," and the excursion into the "Border Land of Science" touching on fads and fancies in the practice of medicine will prove highly instructive.

The author makes frequent reference to the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW which four years ago enlisted most eminent moralists and doctors of medicine in an interesting case of ectopic gestation. Many side-lights, incidental explanations, were thrown upon the subject of craniotomy, as well as upon the uses and abuses of surgical operations, facts which are not easily to be found in text-books, either of morals or of medicine.

JOS. SELINGER, D.D.

SERMONS AND MORAL DISCOURSES for all the Sundays of the year, on the important truths of the Gospel. Edited and in part written by the Rev. Francis X. McGowan, O.S.A. Two volumes. Pp. 621 and 654. Fr. Pustet & Co. : New York and Cincinnati. 1897.

Father McGowan, the Augustinian, enjoys an established reputation as a pleasing and impressive pulpit orator. Hence his judg-

ment as to the choice and adaptation of subject matter for the preacher may be relied upon. In the two handsome volumes before us he collects what he has found most useful in the way of instructive sermon-matter among the old writers, especially Billot, Perrin, St. Thomas of Villanova, and others of equal merit who are not so well known to the English reader. The topics are arranged to suit the order of Sundays in the ecclesiastical year. These form the contents of one volume. The second volume contains sermons suitable for the *Tridua* in honor of the Bl. Sacrament and of Our Lady of Good Counsel, sermons in behalf of the Poor Souls, and some discourses for a short *Retreat* of a Young Men's Sodality.

There is no attempt in these sermons to exhibit particular beauty of form and style; they are the thoughts of great minds put in clear and plain language, with special reference to the needs of our American life.

The hope of the author, that the work will serve his fellow priests by offering them something which, in their office of preachers, is likely to stimulate noble thought and beneficent action, is well grounded.

THE LIFE OE CHRIST. By the Rev. J. Duggan, Cath. Priest of Maidstone.—London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1897. Pp. 243.

The title of this volume is apt to mislead as to its actual contents. It is not a connected narrative of our Lord's life in His human nature, but rather an explanation of some phases in the evangelical history which are difficult to understand. Why our Lord repeatedly charged His disciples "strictly that they were to tell no man," when He knew that they would not keep His command; why the Jews should have requested "a sign" when our Lord had just wrought one or more miracles; why He should have permitted the devil to destroy the swine of the Gerasenes; why He spoke continually in parables not understood by all; these and similar incidents in the public life of Christ have not received their adequate explanation from the popular exegetes. Father Duggan, by entering more deeply into and centering the attention upon the double purpose of our Lord's Messianic mission, obtains a clue which sheds much light upon these obscure portions of the Gospel narrative. We fancy it would have been possible for him to be more brief, to go more directly to the point at issue; for the average reader, once he

has seized the specific difficulty which the author proposes to solve, is apt to become restless under the frequent repetition of and insistence upon arguments showing where others have been deficient in solving. It is of course true that to prove the insufficiency of the reasons which are or may be alleged for a certain opinion, is an aid to clearness, and on the whole strengthens the ultimate demonstration, still that method has its limits; and all the more when the style of expression, as in the case of our author, is otherwise simple and couched in short syllogistic phrases which put the mind on the alert for a quick sequence of fresh thought.

DE RELIGIONE REVELATA Libri Quinque. Auctore Guilelmo Wilmers, S.J. Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Frid. Pustet. 1897. Pp. 686.

The present work is an outcome of the popularity which the former volumes of P. Wilmers (*Lehrbuch der Religion*, 4 vols.) had long ago gained among German students of catechetical literature. Not only his method, but the scrupulous care with which he gathers aside what is really of importance and useful in demonstration and religious argument, have made it desirable that he should present the same subject-matter in a language understood by a larger circle of students.

P. Wilmers treats his matter in a thoroughly scholastic way, that is to say, there is a clear and uniform method to which he adheres in developing the great fact of Christianity from its essential foundations. In the *Prolegomena* he states a number of *asserta* with scholia and corollaries which serve the purpose of clearly defining the terms and fixing the position of the inquirer after truth. In the chapters which follow we have first the demonstration of the necessity, the convenience and actuality of a revealed religion, based on reason and facts. Then the claim of the Christian religion with its foundation in the promise of a Messiah and its forecastings in the Mosaic legislation is proved; the insufficiency of all other claims on similar ground by pagan or Jewish apologists being shown, the author proceeds, like St. Paul in his address to the Romans, to establish the exclusive and lasting right of the Christian faith to possess all men's hearts. All this is done in the usual form of articles with subordinate propositions and scholia. The accessory proofs and illustrations are printed in less prominent type, so that it is easy to grasp the main line of argument distinct from the sustain-

ing elements which the philosopher and historian furnish toward the general proof. P. Wilmers lays special stress upon the so-called proofs from *human* testimony which are frequently passed over by writers in theology; and this feature we believe to be a particular merit of apologetic works in these days of universal skepticism, since the mind is thereby prepared for the acceptance of that higher authority upon which all revelation ultimately rests.

The venerable author has prepared a second volume *De Ecclesia Christi*, which is now in press; and we may cherish the hope that despite his more than four score years he will complete the course with a third volume *De Fide Fideique Regulis*, over which the writer saw him a short time ago bending his snow-white head. May the Master tarry with His call until it is all done by the same careful and laborious hand, A. M. D. G.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. By the Rev. Joseph Bruneau, SS., Prof. of S. Script. St. Joseph's Seminary, New York. Tournai (Belgium): Society of St. John: Desclée, Lefebvre & Co. 1897. Pp. 130. Pr. bd. 60 cents.

Our Catholic Professors of S. Scripture are evidently in working mood. Within the present year there have been additions to the departments of Introduction, Criticism and Exegesis, not to mention the text-editions in English and the apologetic works which deal with the Bible, such as Dr. Zahm's and Father Thein's scientific treatises. Of "Harmonies" of the Gospel we have had Fr. Maas' *Life of Christ* and Father Coleridge's *Life of Our Life*, which, like Father Bruneau's volume, have for their object to give the reader of the New Testament an immediate survey of the evangelical account. It is well known that the first three evangelists relate substantially the same facts regarding the life and death and the teaching of our Lord. They differ, however, both in fulness of detail and in the order in which they narrate the same events. The "Harmony," following the chronological order as far as it is known from the evangels, groups together the details of each incident as related by the different writers, and thus produces a more complete picture of the life and teaching of our Lord than could be gleaned from each separate Gospel. St. John's Gospel contains only about one-twelfth of the narrative detailed by the other three evangelists. Hence his account is largely distinct and forms what

has been called the theological view of Christ's personality, as contrasted with the merely historical view.

Father Bruneau's volume was meant to bring into smaller compass what Fr. Maas had done in a critical and broader fashion in his *Life of Christ*, and students will be glad to have this synopsis in convenient and cheap form. The letterpress of rather small type (brevier) is clear, and in the neat ornamental style which is a characteristic feature of the firm under whose auspices the volume is issued.

A GENERAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By A. E. Breen, D.D. Rochester: The John P. Smith Printing House. 1897. Pp. 606. Pr. bd., $4.00.

The need of a good English text-book of "Introduction to the Study of the Sacred Scriptures" has been felt in our seminaries for many years; and latterly also in the higher lay schools where the impulse given to biblical studies within and outside the Church has reached.

The most weighty contribution to this field, since Dixon wrote his volume some fifty years ago, comes from Dr. Breen, of Rochester Seminary. He is his own publisher, and has taken advantage of this fact to secure for the student a volume of large pages with clear print, on excellent paper, allowing wide margins for annotations, giving illustrations—in short, furnishing an attractive looking royal octavo which does honor to the bookmakers' art.

The scope which Dr. Breen sets for himself in the work covers the usual tracts treating of the Canon, the different text editions, the versions, and the various systems of interpretation; that is to say, it corresponds to the first twelve dissertations in Dixon's "General Introduction." The fact that this matter, which even Dixon lengthens out quite unnecessarily, extends over nearly 600 pages, is due to the thoroughness with which Dr. Breen verifies his principal theses, especially that which establishes the canonicity of the so-called deutero-canonical books. Here we find unabbreviated passages from every post-apostolic writer who is supposed to have cited the deutero-canonical books.

Personally, we doubt the efficiency of this method of proof from a practical point of view. Indeed, the entire traditional system of establishing the claim of inspiration seems to us to miss its mark when we consider the temper of those with whom we have to argue;

for the historic and archeologic data which every student finds within reach suggest a change of system by the adoption of arguments which present a less didactic, though no less conclusive evidence. When you have shown that the testimony of history establishes the genuineness of the Gospels more conclusively than that of any other literary document in existence, by an appeal to two sources—the friends and the enemies of Christianity in the second and third centuries, you have done everything that a candid mind has a right to demand. A single document of unquestioned authenticity on each side will do all the external proof required, and that more effectually than the collation of many dubious passages which admit of objections and weaken the better arguments by the very association.

Take an instance, the first that comes to our hand, page 67. For the proof of the canonicity of Baruch reference is made to the fact that Athenagoras uses the following words in an address to the conquerors Marc. Aurelius and Commodus: "Dominus Deus noster; non comparabitur alius ad illum." These words are supposed to show that Athenagoras must have read Baruch's words, chapt. iii., 36, "hic est Deus noster, neque est alius qui cum ipso comparetur." Surely words so commonplace, so few, might have been used by a thousand people who never read them in Baruch. If Athenagoras had read Moses' Deuteronomy, he must have met the same words several times, and, for that matter, he might have found them in some pagan author of the golden period of Greece or Rome. To use them as arguments in this case would be equivalent to a confession that our strongest proofs are at best too weak for a sensible man who does not already believe what we propose to demonstrate to him. The canonicity of Scripture is accepted by Catholic students on higher ground than demonstration, namely, on the sufficient motive of credibility which supports the confession of the Catholic faith; but the professor is to give the students weapons by which to convince infidels, or, at all events, non-Catholics, who are not always free from prejudice, and who will, therefore, suspect our arguments unless they are such as are really convincing.

However, we do not wish to declaim against the use of methods which are sanctioned by the practice of able teachers. Dr. Breen finds probably in his own experience good reason for laying so much stress upon arguments which to us seem a waste of energy. There is a great deal of laborious collating, of valuable erudition in the work. How far, under the ordinary system and available time

for study in our seminaries, the volume can serve as a text-book for students must depend on the way it is used by the professor. To complete the study of the Introduction would require two more volumes of equal or proportionately even larger size, namely, one to deal with the historical data, the political, sacred and domestic antiquities of the Jews, and another of special introduction to the separate books.

But whatever use the professors of Sacred Scripture may be able to make of this work as a text-book for their classes, we must be thankful to Dr. Breen for his having attempted to enrich the literature in this direction, for he evidently appreciates the value of the subject and the need of presenting it in worthy attire.

ALL HALLOWS ANNUAL. 1896-'97. Dublin: Printed by Browne & Nolan. 1897. Pp. 126.

The American alumni of "All Hallows" will find in this year's report of their Alma Mater's condition exceptional matter of interest to them. The College is, and it seems with good reason, proud of its American graduates, a goodly number of whom occupy episcopal chairs and other important positions which prove the efficiency of their previous training. The devotion with which the former pupils uphold the interests of the College, and their generosity in helping to replace the old chapel destroyed in the late fire, by a beautiful gothic church, is a magnificent testimony to the traditional spirit which prevails in the College itself. The last two "Fourth Divinity Classes" show that the number of students from the United States has recently been greater than in previous years, which speaks well for the management of the Lazarist Fathers who have had charge of the College since 1892, although the trusteeship is vested in the Archbishops of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel and Tuam.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PERSONAL FRIENDSHIPS OF JESUS. By J. R. Miller, D.D. New York and Boston: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 16mo. Pp. 267, cloth. Pr. $1.00.

MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE. The Basis of Medical Jurisprudence. By the Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. 222. Pr. $1.50.

THE ENGLISH BLACK MONKS OF ST. BENEDICT. A Sketch of their history from the coming of St. Augustine to the present day. By the Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton. Vol. I., pp. 310; Vol. II., pp. 367. London: John C. Nimmo. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1897. Pr. $7.50.

INSTITUTIONES PHILOSOPHIAE NATURALIS secundum principia S. Thomae Aquinatis, ad usum scholasticum accommodavit Tilmannus Pesch, S.J. (*Series. Instit. Philosophiae Schol. edita a presbyteris Soc. Jesu.*) Vol. I. Editio altera, pp. xxviii.—444; Vol. II. Ed. altera, pp. xix.—406. 1897. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., Freiburg. Pr. duo vol. (half mor., net.) $3.85.

NOTES D'UN CATECHISTE: ou Court Commentaire Littéral sur le Catéchisme des Provinces Ecclésiastiques de Québec, Montréal, Ottawa. Par un Prêtre du Diocèse de Montréal. Montréal: Cadieux et Derome. 1897. Pp. 708.

THE EUCHARISTIC CHRIST. Reflections and Considerations on the Blessed Sacrament. By the Rev. A. Tesnière, Priest of the Congregation of the Bl. Sacrament. Translated by Mrs. Anne R. Bennett-Gladstone. Preface by the Rev. D. J. McMahon, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. 187; pr. $1.00.

THE MISSION BOOK of the Redemptorist Fathers. A manual of Instructions and Prayers adapted to preserve the fruits of the Mission. Drawn chiefly from the works of St. Alphonsus. The same. 1897. Pp. 438; pr. 50 cents to $2.50.

THE WONDER-WORKER OF PADUA. By Charles Warren Stoddard. Notre Dame, Ind.: *The Ave Maria.* 1897. Pp. 193; pr. 50 cents.

A GENERAL AND CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By A. E. Breen, D.D., Rochester, N. Y.: The John P. Smith Printing House. 1897. Pp. 626. Pr. $4.00

THE WORST BOY IN THE SCHOOL. By Michael J. A. McCaffrey, LL.D. With illustrations by George F. Of, Jr. New York: G. W. Dillingham Co. 1897. Pp. 59.

SAINT AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY AND HIS COMPANIONS. From the French of Father Brou, S.J. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company; Catholic Truth Society; New York: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. 188

PRINCE ARUMUGAM, the steadfast Indian convert. Translated from the German by Helena Long. Second edition. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1897. Pp. 115; pr. 45 cents.

A PAGE OF CHURCH HISTORY IN NEW YORK: St. John's Church, Utica, N. Y. Addresses By the Very Rev. J. S. M. Lynch, D.D.

STORIES ON THE ROSARY. By Louisa Emily Dobrée. Longmans, Green & Co.: London, New York, Bombay. 1897. Pp. 172; pr. 50 cents.

ILLUSTRATED EXPLANATION OF THE PRAYERS AND CEREMONIES OF THE MASS. By the Rev. D. I. Lauslots, O.S.B. New York: Benziger Bros. 1897. Pp. 327: pr. $1.25.

A ROUND TABLE of the Representative Irish and English Catholic Novelists. The same. 1897. Pp. 338; $1.50.

HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND. By William Cobbett. Revised, with Notes and Preface, by the Very Rev. Francis Aidan Gasquet, D. D., O S.B. The same. 1897. Pp. 406, pr. paper, 25 cents.

Non-Circulating
For Use In Library Only

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON. MASS.

Non-Circulating
For Use In Library Only

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 08639 3

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.